

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN  
VISWA BHARATI  
LIBRARY

277

N 26

Vol. 7











GENERAL HISTORY  
OF THE  
CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH:

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF  
DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER,  
BY  
JOSEPH TORREY,  
PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

NEW EDITION, CAREFULLY REVISED.

---

"I am come to send fire on the earth."—*Words of our Lord.*  
"And the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." "But other foundation  
can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus."—*St. Paul.*

---

VOLUME SEVENTH.

LONDON:  
HENRY G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.  
1852.

---

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET.

## TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THESE volumes (vii. and viii.) complete the translation of the General History of the Christian religion and church, as far as the work had been published when its lamented author was called away from the scene of his earthly labours. Another volume, as he himself intimates in the Preface to his Tenth Part, was to have brought the history of the church down to the times of the Reformation. What progress had been made by the author in preparing this interesting portion of his work for the press, I do not certainly know, though I feel strongly confident it must have been such that the last labours of the eminent historian will not long be withheld from the public. In a letter to the publisher dated April 9, 1848, Dr. Neander writes that he was then occupied with this promised volume; and it is well known, that one of the last acts of his life was to dictate a sentence of it to his amanuensis. As he had therefore been employed upon it for as long a time, to say the least, as had ever intervened between the dates of his earlier volumes, it is not unreasonable to conjecture that the volume was left by him in a sufficient state of forwardness to admit of being finished without much labour. That it may be so finished, and the whole work brought down to the epoch to which the author in his later volumes was evidently looking forward as a resting-place, must appear highly desirable to every one who is capable of appreciating the minute and comprehensive learning, the scrupulous fidelity, the unexampled candour and simplicity of spirit, the unobtrusive but pervading glow of Christian piety, which have thus so far eminently characterized every portion of this great work.

If such a volume should soon be given to the world, the publisher of the present translation will take measures to have it converted into English.

J. TORREY.

*July 31, 1851.*

# DEDICATION

## OF THE FIRST PART OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

---

TO MY DEAR AND HONOURED FRIEND

DR. RITSCHL

BISHOP IN STETTIN.

EVER since I had the happiness to be thrown by official relations, when you were still amongst us, into closer contact with you, and through your examinations over the department of practical theology, as well as by cordial intercourse to become more accurately acquainted with your peculiar spirit, your way of interpreting the signs of these times, labouring with the birth-throes of a new age of the world, and your judgment as to what the church in these times needs before all things else, I felt myself related to you, not by the common tie of Christian fellowship alone, but also by a special sympathy of spirit. And when you left us, called by the Lord to act in another great sphere for the advancement of his kingdom, your dear image still remained deeply engraven on my heart. In your beautiful pastoral letters I recognized again the same doctrines of Christian wisdom, drawn from the study of the Divine Word and of history, to which I had often heard you bear testimony before; and when I had the pleasure of once more seeing you face to face, it served to revive the ancient fellowship. Often has the wish come over my mind of giving you some public expression of my cordial regard. To the bishop who in his first pastoral letters so beautifully refers the servants of the church to that which is only to be learned in the school of life, in History, I dedicated part of the present work, devoted to the history of the kingdom of God. And I feel myself constrained to dedicate to the bishop of the dear *Pommeranian* church, that volume of my work in particular which describes the active operations of its original founder. That kindred spirit, even in its errors, you will greet with your wonted benevolence.

May the Lord long preserve you by his grace for his church on earth, and bless your work!

These times, torn by the most direct contrarieties, vacillating be-

tyeen licentiousness and servility, between the bold denial of God and the deification of the letter, needs such men, who recognize the necessary unity and the necessary manifoldness, and who understand how to guide free minds with love and wisdom, being themselves disciples of eternal love and wisdom. May all learn from you not to hunt after new things which are not also old, nor to cling to old things which will not become new; but, as you advise in your first pastoral letter, to form themselves into such scribes as know how to bring out of their good treasures things both old and new, just as the truth which they serve is an old truth, and at the same time always new.

With my whole heart, yours,

A. NEANDER.

*Berlin, March 5, 1841.*

---



## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

## TO THE FIRST PART OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

I HERE present to the public the first part of the history of that important period, so rich in materials, the flourishing times of the Middle Ages; thanking God that he has enabled me to bring this laborious work to an end, while engaged in discharging the duties of a difficult calling.

I must beg the learned reader would have the goodness to suspend his judgment respecting the arrangement and distribution of the matter till the whole shall be completed. Notwithstanding that M. H——, in his recension of the two preceding volumes, in the literary leaves of the Darmstadt Church Gazette, has expressed himself so strongly, I have still thought proper in this volume also, to incorporate the history of Monachism with that of the church constitution. No one, doubtless, except M. H——, will believe me to be so childish or so stupid as to have done this merely because it is customary to speak also of a constitution of Monachism. The reasons which have induced me to adopt the plan I have chosen, will readily present themselves to the attentive reader; though I am free to confess that another arrangement is possible, and that the reference to a Christian life is made prominent by me in the second section also, as belongs, indeed, to the special point of view from which I write my Church History. I should have many things to answer to the above-mentioned reviewer, if the judgment of a reviewer were really anything more than the judgment of any other reader or nonreader. That the remark concerning Claudius of Turin was neither unimportant nor superfluous, every one may easily convince himself, who takes the least interest in a thorough scientific understanding of the history of doctrines. As to my theological position, I demand for that the condescending tolerance of no man; but shall know very well how to defend it on scientific grounds.

I regret that the second volume of Barthold's History of Pommernania did not reach me till after the printed sheets of the whole section were already lying before me.

I must direct the attention of the readers of my Church History to the Atlas of Ecclesiastical History, soon to be given to the world by Candidate Wiltch, of Wittenberg, which will prove a welcome present to every friend of the history of the church.

In conclusion, I thank my worthy friend, the preacher elect, Selbach, for the fidelity and care with which he has assisted me during the transit of my work through the press, and wish him the richest blessing in his new sphere of labour in the kingdom of God.

A. NEANDER.

*Berlin, March 5, 1144.*

---

## AUTHOR'S PREFACE

### TO THE SECOND PART OF THE FIFTH VOLUME.

I REJOICE that I am here able at length to present to the public the fruits of my favourite studies for many years—an exhibition of the Christian life, of the development of the theology and of the history of the sect during the flourishing times of the Middle Ages. Would that the many new facts which ever and anon have presented themselves as the result of my inquiries, may serve as some of my earlier labours have done, to call forth new investigations, which might tend to promote the cause of science by confirming that which I have advanced, filling up what I have left defective, or stating the other side of facts where I have stated but one side. I regret that my attention was drawn too late to Dr. Gieseler's Programme on the Summas of Rainer, and that I received it too late to be able to avail myself of it in treating the history of the sects. I regret it the more, as I am aware how much the labours of this distinguished inquirer have aided me in other investigations where our studies have happened to be directed to the same subjects. It is a great pity that, by this custom of academical programmes, many an important scientific essay, which, published by itself or inserted in some journal, might soon be generally dispersed abroad, is to many entirely lost or at least escapes their notice at the particular moment when they could have derived the most benefit from it. The latest volume of Ritter on Christian philosophy is a work also to which I could not of course have any regard. Also the Essay of Dr. Pianck, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, J. 1844, 4tes Heft, on a tract cited in my work, the *Contra quatuor Gallie Labyrinthos* of Walter of Mauretania, is a production to which I must refer my readers, as having appeared too late for my purpose.

I have to lament, that of the ten volumes of the works of Raymond Lull, there are two which I have not been able to consult, as they are nowhere to be met with. If it be the fact that these two

missing volumes cannot be restored, it is certainly desirable that some individual would do himself the honour of completing the edition from the manuscripts in the Royal Library of Munich.

I have not compared my earlier labours on the subject of Abelard with this new representation of the man. By those writings of which Dr. Rheinwald \* and Cousin have first presented to the world, an impulse has been given to many a new inquiry and new mode of apprehending the character of that celebrated individual.

In continuation of the present work there will follow, if God permit, an account of the times down to the period of the Reformation, in one volume.

I heartily thank Professor Schönmann, for the extraordinary kindness with which, as Superintendent of the Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel, he has communicated its treasures for my use, without which it would have been out of my power to complete many an investigation of which the results are to be found in this volume. And in conclusion, I thank my dear young friend, H. Rössel, not only for the care he has bestowed on the correction of the press, but also for the pains and skill with which he has drawn up the Table of Contents, and the Register.

A. NEANDER.

*Berlin, Dec. 3, 1844.*

\* The *Archivarius* not barely of 'Modern Church History,' to whom I wish the most abundant support of all kinds in the very important undertakings in behalf of literature in which he is engaged, an edition of the collected writings of Valentine Andreae, one of the great prophetic men of Germany; the Acta of the council of Basle, after the plan of the one which Hermann of Hardt has furnished of the council of Costnitz; and the Continuation of his *Acta Historico-Ecclesiastica*, a work which must prove so important for the present and for future times.

---

# CONTENTS OF VOL. VII.

## FIFTH PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

FROM GREGORY THE SEVENTH TO BONIFACE THE EIGHTH. FROM A.D. 1073 TO A.D. 1294.

### [FIRST DIVISION.]

### SECTION FIRST.

#### EXTENSION AND LIMITS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

#### 1. *Among the Heathen*, 1—79.

##### A. EUROPE.

	Page
<i>Pommerania</i> . Unsuccessful missionary labours of partially converted Poles, and of the Spanish monk Bernard . . .	1
Early life of Otto; his activity as Bishop of Bamberg; his call to be an apostle among the Pommeranians . . .	4
Otto's journey through Poland; his reception by the Dukes of Poland and Pommerania . . . . .	8
The first baptized converts in Pommerania. Pagan festival at Pyritz; preparatory instruction and baptism of seven thousand! farewell exhortations . . . . .	11
Favourable disposition of Wartislav and his wife. Successful operations and planting of the first church in <i>Kammin</i> . Supposed divine judgment on account of breaking the Sabbath . . . . .	12
Otto, and his timid companions, in the free city of <i>Julin</i> . Fury of the pagans; secret Christians there. Citizens agree to follow the example of Stettin . . . . .	1
Arrival at <i>Stettin</i> . Religious condition of the pagan inhabitants. Embassy to Poland. Otto's influence; upheld by a Christian family . . . . .	13
Boleslav's letter. Otto's method in destroying the monuments of Idolatry. Death of a heathen priest . . . . .	19

	Page
Otto in <i>Garz</i> , <i>Lebbehn</i> . <i>Julin</i> converted, and destined for a bishoprick. Success in Clonoda (Gollnow), Naugard, Colberg, and Belgrade . . . . .	20
Visitation-tour, and return of Otto to Bamberg . . . . .	21
Reaction of Paganism in Pommerania. Otto's second missionary journey. His influence upon Wartislav in <i>Demmin</i> . Speech of the latter at the diet in Usedom . . . . .	23
Influence of a pagan priest in <i>Wolgast</i> . Course of events there till Christianity triumphs . . . . .	26
Otto's successful labours in <i>Gutzkow</i> ; his discourse at the dedication of a church. Salutory example of Mizlav . . . . .	28
Boleslav's military expedition renounced. Otto's interview with Wartislav. Otto's strong desire to visit Rugen. Attempts of Ulric to visit that island defeated. Otto's treatment of his clergy . . . . .	32
Stettin, a town partly pagan, partly Christian. Wistack's conversion. His support of Otto. Otto's calmness amidst the infuriated pagans. Adoption of Christianity resolved upon in an assembly of the people. Otto's treatment of children. Dangers to which he exposed himself . . . . .	34
Successful operations in <i>Julin</i> . Otto's return to Bamberg; he continues to be interested in behalf of the Pommeranians. German clergy and colonists in Pommerania . . . . .	41
Rügen conquered by the Danes. Planting of the Christian church there by Absalom . . . . .	42
Wendish kingdom of Gottschalk, under his successors. Spread of Christianity there . . . . .	43
<i>Vicelin's</i> earlier life. His zealous and painful labours, in connection with Dittmar, among the Slaves. Religious societies and missionary schools . . . . .	44
<i>Liefland</i> . Planting of the Christian church there. Missionary operations of Meinhard (first church in Yxküll). Crusades of Theodoric and Berthold against the Lieflanders. <i>Albert</i> of Appeldern. Riga made a bishoprick. Brethren of the Sword. Esthland, Sengallen, Curland, christianized . . . . .	49
Spiritual dramas. Theological lectures of <i>Andrew</i> of Lund. Sigfrid in Holm. Frederic of Celle martyred in Friedland. John Strick's behaviour during an attack from the Letti. Impression produced by a spiritual song. Converts to Christianity come to a consciousness of their equal rights and dignity as men. Change in the character of the laws. Exhortations of William of Mqlena . . . . .	52
<i>Prussia</i> . Missionary labours of Adalbert of Prague, and <i>Bruno Bouiface</i> , till their martyrdom. Gottfried of Lucina; and monk Philip. <i>Christian's</i> labours, sustained by Innocent the Third (through his letters and briefs). Completion of the works by the German knights and brethren of the sword. Four bishoprics . . . . .	55
Finland converted to Christianity . . . . .	61

## B. ASIA.

	Page
<i>Tartary.</i> Activity of the <i>Nestorians</i> in spreading Christianity.	
Legend of the Christian kingdom in Keraït, under the priest-kings John. Historical basis of this story . . . .	62
<i>Mongols.</i> Empire of Dschingiskhan. Religious condition of the Mongols. Unsuccessful embassies of Innocent the Fourth	64
Influence of the Crusades. Embassy of Louis the Ninth. Statements of William of Rubruquis. His conversation and participation in the religious conference betwixt the different parties . . . . .	69
The Mongol empire in Persia . . . . .	75
Lamaism in the main empire of China. Report of Marco Polo, who enjoyed the protection of Koblaikhan . . . .	76
Missionary activity of John de Monte Corvino in Persia, India, China. His successful labours in Cambalu (Pekin). The Nestorian prince George becomes Catholic; reaction of Nestorianism after his death . . . . .	77

2. *Among the Mohammedans in Africa*, 80—96.

Relation of the Mohammedans to Christianity during the Crusades. Francis of Assisi in Egypt. Different accounts of him. Report of Jacob of Vitry . . . . .	80
Science as an instrument for the spread of Christianity. Raymond Lull's earlier life. His conversion, and his plan of labour. His <i>Ars generalis</i> opposed to two parties. Relation of faith to knowledge. Linguistic missionary schools at Majorca. Lull's voyage to Tunis and its result. His <i>Tabular generalis</i> and <i>Necessaria</i> demonstratio. His labours in Europe, and second journey to North Africa (Bugia). His banishment; shipwreck near Pisa. His labours as a teacher in Paris; his threefold plan. Dies a martyr in Bugia . . . . .	82

3. *Relation of the Christian Church to the Jews*, 97—110.

The monk Hermann on the treatment of the Jews. False reports concerning them; fanatical behaviour towards them. Bernard of Clairvaux defends them, and puts down Rudolph. Peter of Cluny hostile to the Jews . . . . .	79
The popes their protectors. Innocent the Second and the Third. Briefs of Gregory the Ninth and of Innocent the Fourth . . . .	102
Points of dispute with the Christians. Objections stated to a Jew, and their refutation by Gislebert . . . . .	104
Doubts and conflicts of the convert Hermann . . . . .	107

## SECTION SECOND.

## HISTORY OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

1. *Papacy and the Popes*, 111—273.

	Page
Corruption of the church, and reformatory reaction; Hildebrand's idea of the church as designed to govern the world	
His course of development as conditioned by the times in which he lived. Gregory the Seventh (1073); complaints in the first years of his reign . . . . .	112
Principles of his conduct; Old Testament position in which he stood. Predilection for judgments of God. Veneration of Mary. Papal and royal authority. Monarchical constitution of the church. Gregory and the laws. His legates. Annual synods. Care for the particular nations. Gregory's incorruptible integrity. Persecution of witches forbidden. Gregory's views of penance, of monachism, asceticism. His liberality . . . . .	117
Different expectations from Gregory's government. The story concerning Henry the Fourth. Protests against his election. Letters missive for a reformatory Fast-synod (1074). Opposition to the <i>law of celibacy</i> . Gregory's firmness to his principles in the case of the opposition at Mayence, etc. His union with the laity and monks. His opponents. Letter to Cunibert of Turin. Separatist-heretical movements. Complaints against Gregory . . . . .	124
<i>Lay investiture</i> forbidden. Gregory's proceedings towards Philip the First and Hermann of Bamberg . . . . .	138
<i>Henry the Fourth</i> obeys the pope in respect to simony. Idea of a crusade. Henry violates the peace. Gregory's letter of admonition and embassy. Gregory impeached by Hugo Blancus. Gregory deposed at the council of Worms (1076). Henry's letter to Rome. Gregory's imprisonment by Cintius, and liberation. Ban pronounced on Henry. Impression produced on different parties. Gregory's justification of himself refuted by Waltram. Diet at Tribur . . . . .	141
Henry's journey to Rome (1076-77). Gregory's journey to Germany prevented. His relations with Mathilda. The penitents at Canossa. The host used as an ordeal. The judgment to be formed respecting Gregory's reconciliation with Henry . . . . .	154
Henry violates the peace. Rudolph of Suabia elected (1077). Gregory's ambiguous mode of proceeding. New ban pronounced on Henry (1080). Gregory deposed and Clement the Third elected. Henry in Italy prepared for peace. Gregory's firmness; his death (1085); his <i>Dictates</i> . . . . .	160
Continuance of the contest after Gregory. Victor the Third.	

Urban the Second. Philip the First's controversies concerning his marriage. Firm and bold stand of Yves of Chartres, and his fate. Ban pronounced on Philip . . .	165
Occasion of the <i>Crusades</i> . <i>Pèter</i> the Hermit. Ecclesiastical assemblies at Placenza and Clermont . . . . .	169
Speech of Urban the Second. Enthusiasm called forth. Different motives of the crusaders. Spiritual orders of knights. Pious frauds, together with examples of faith .	172
Papal authority increased by the <i>Crusades</i> . Change effected in Urban's situation till his death. Death of the anti-pope Clement the Third . . . . .	177
Continued contests of Henry the Fifth. Robert of Flanders stirred up by Paschalis the Second. Bold letter of the clergy of Liege (by Singibert of Gemblours) to Paschalis .	179
Disputes with Henry the Fifth about Investiture. Compact at Sutri, A.D. 1110. New compact, A.D. 1112. Reproaches brought against Paschalis the Second. Gottfried of Vendôme representative of the sterner party. Milder judgment of Hildebert of Mans and Yves of Chartres. John of Lyons. The tract of Placidus of Nonantula. Paschalis before the Lateran council. New disputes about investiture . . . . .	184
Gelasius the Second, and the imperial pope Gregory the Eighth. Attempt to restore peace by the monk Hugo. Neutral stand taken by Gottfried of Vendôme. Concordat of Worms between Calixtus the Second and Henry the Fifth, A.D. 1122 . . . . .	194
The anti-popes, Innocent the Second and Anaclete the Second. Innocent in France, supported by Bernard; healing of a schism in the church by the latter; his conduct towards William of Aquitania. Innocent triumphant in Rome .	198
Opposition to the laity of the secularized clergy. Influence of the disputes about investiture . . . . .	201
Arnold of Brescia; his education, particularly under the influence of Abelard; his asceticism, and fierce invectives against the clergy; his life in exile . . . . .	203
Arnold's principles in Rome. His return under Celestin the Second. Lucius the Second. Anti-papal letter of the Romans to Conrad the Third . . . . .	206
Eugene the Third. Bernard's letter to him. Eugene in France supported by Bernard. Great success attending his preaching of the crusades. His moderated enthusiasm. The awakening called forth. Twofold influence of Bernard. Opinions respecting the issue of the second crusade . . . . .	210
Eugene's return to Rome. Bernard's four books. <i>De consideratione</i> , addressed to him . . . . .	217
Continuation of the quarrels under Adrian the Fourth. Letter of the Roman Nobles to Frederic the First. Fall of Arnold's party. Arnold's death excused by the Roman court	222



	Page
Arnold's ideas continue to work. Conflict of the Hohenstaufens with the hierarchy. First expedition of Frederic the First against Rome. Adrian's letter to Frederic respecting the term <i>beneficium</i> . Step taken by Frederic on the other side.	
• Reconciliation of the two parties in 1158. New difficulties.	
Correspondence between the parties. Adrian dies 1159 .	224
Alexander the Third, and the imperial pope Victor the Fourth. The council of Paris in favour of the latter in 1160. Victor's successors. Frederic the First's reconciliation with Alexander, 1177. The Lateran council in 1179 determines the order of papal elections. . . . .	231
Thomas Beckett made archbishop of Canterbury 1162; his difficulties with Henry the Second; his repentance at having signed the articles at <i>Clarendon</i> ; his quarrel and reconciliation with Henry the Second; his assassination. Impression produced by what happened at his tomb. Henry's penance . . . . .	234
Arnold's principles propagated by the Hohenstaufens. Henry the Sixth, and Celestin the Third . . . . .	238
Government of Innocent the Third an epoch in the history of the papacy, 1198-1216. Motives to his great activity. Successful contest with John of England, 1208-13. Voices against him . . . . .	239
Innocent in favour of Otho the Fourth; opposite to the party of <i>Philip</i> ; afterwards in favour of <i>Frederic the Second</i> .	243
<i>Honorius the Third. Gregory the Ninth.</i> Frederic's crusade. Compact with Gregory, and the issue of a new ban. Frederic's circular letter. Gregory's accusations. Frederic's ideas of reform, or rather his sceptical bent of mind. Contest till the death of Gregory, 1241 . . . .	245
Celestin the Fourth. Frederic the Second's contests, till his death, with Innocent the Fourth. His circular-letter after the ban passed upon him at Lyons . . . . .	253
Robert Grosshead's discourse before the papal court at Lyons. His labours in England, and his unchecked boldness towards Rome . . . . .	256
Legend concerning the death of Innocent the Fourth. Alexander the Fourth. Gregory the Tenth. Want of zeal for the crusades at Lyons, in 1274. Abbot Joachim opposed to them. Arguments against the crusades combated by Humbert de Romanis . . . . .	259
Raymund Lull's threefold plan in his <i>Disputatio</i> . His view of the crusades, and mode of procedure with infidels . .	263
Determinations with regard to papal elections by John the . . . . . Twenty-first revoked. Celestin the Fifth, as pope. His abdication . . . . .	266
Result of the history of the papacy under Gregory the Seventh. Unsuccessful efforts against the mischievous papal absolutism (interview of John of Salisbury with Adrian the Fourth). Bribery at the Roman court. Eugene the Third	268

2. *Distinct Branches of the Papal Government of the Church,*  
273—283.

	Page
Personal labours of the popes. Different modes of conduct pursued by their legates. The Roman curia, as the highest tribunal. Capricious appeals to Rome limited by Innocent the Third . . . . .	273
Relative dependence of the bishops. The form of oath taken by them. Influence of the popes in appointments to benefices. Complaints about exemption from the authority of the bishops. Pragmatic sanction of Louis the Ninth . .	276
Collection of ecclesiastical laws. Study of the civil law at Bologna. The Decretum Gratiani. Ancient and more modern ecclesiastical law enriched by the decisions of the pope. Interpolated bulls. Raymund's decretals . . .	281

3. *Other Parts of the Church Constitution,* 284—296.

Consequences of the Hildebrandian epoch of Reform. Its slight moral influence upon the clergy. Abuses in ecclesiastical preferments combated in vain . . . . .	284
Reformation of the clergy. Norbert's congregation. Gerhoh's Clerici regulares. Difference amongst the secular clergy. The latter as preachers of repentance . . . . .	287
Fulco of Neuilly; his education and influence as a preacher of repentance; his influence upon the clergy; his preaching of the crusades. Peter de Rusia, a preacher of repentance in opposition to the system of the church . . . . .	289
Archdeacons. Officiales in the more general and in the more restricted sense. The bishops. Valuable labours of Peter of Moustier. Gerhoh opposed to the secular sword in the hands of bishops and popes. Titular bishops . . . .	292

4. *Prophetic Warnings against the Secularization of the Church,*  
298—322.

Possession of Property injurious to the church. Prophetic element in the development of the church . . . . .	298
<i>Hildegard.</i> Great reverence with which she was regarded. Her admonitions and counsels; her invectives against the clergy, and her prophecies . . . . .	300
<i>Abbot Joachim.</i> His active labours; his ideas; his genuine writings, and the spurious ones attributed to him; his invectives against the corrupt court of Rome; against Paschalis the Second, and his successors. Worldly goods and secular supports injurious to the church. Inward Christianity. God and the apostolic church. The anti-christ (Pataranes), the destined instrument of punishment.	• •

	Page
The Hohenstaufens. The three periods of revelation, and the three apostles representing them. Joachim's view of historical Christianity. Form and essence of Christianity	304
5. <i>History of Monasticism</i> , 322—405.	
Monachism, and the tendency of the times. Pious mothers, and other influences which served to promote it. Worldly temper in the monasteries brought about especially by the <i>oblats</i> . Salutary examples of such men as Elbrard and Simon. Motives of those who embraced monachism. Pardoned criminals gained, and other moral influences of the monks . . . . .	322
Anselm on monachism and the worldly life. Early vows renounced. Various influence of the monks. Their sermons on repentance. Religious aberrations and conflicts. Admonitions of Anselm and Bernard . . . . .	328
Yves of Chartres, Raymund Lull, and Peter of Cluny on the eremite life. Preachers of repentance. Worldly and hypocritical monks . . . . .	334
Norbert, founder of the <i>Premonstratensians</i> . His miracles. Education and labours of Robert of Arbrissel. The <i>Pauperis Christi</i> , and the nuns at Fons Elbraldi. Robert's invectives against the clergy. Opinions respecting him . . . . .	339
<i>Cluniacensians</i> . Predecessors of <i>Mauritius</i> . His exhortations against extravagant asceticism. His letters . . . . .	345
Robert, founder of the Cistercians. His successors. Bernard led to monachism. His rigid asceticism. His influential labours in <i>Clairvaux</i> . His relation to the popes. His miracles, judged by himself and by others. His exhortation to the <i>Templars</i> . His theology of the heart. On love, and its several stages. Constant reference to Christ. Different positions in Christianity. The spirit of calumny and self-knowledge . . . . .	348
Differences betwixt the Cluniacensians and Cistercians. Bernard's Apologia. Spiritual worship of the monks . . . . .	365
Bruno, founder of the order of the <i>Carthusians</i> . Their occupations and strict mode of life. <i>Carmelites</i> , founded by Berthold . . . . .	367
Societies formed to take charge of the leprous and other sick persons. Abuse of Christian charity. Order of the <i>Trinitarians</i> . . . . .	369
Law against new foundations. <i>Mendicant monks</i> , in their relation to the church. Didacus and Dominick in contest with the heretics of South France. Order of the <i>Dominicans</i> confirmed . . . . .	371
Conversion of Francis. His religious bent. Idea of the evangelical poverty; his reception with the pope and cardinals; his mortifications; sayings concerning asceticism, prayer, preaching. Mystical, sensuous element in his	

character. His love of nature. Marks of the wounds.	
• <i>Minorites. Order of Clara, Tertiaries . . . . .</i>	75
Laborious and influential activity in the mendicants. Their relation to the clergy; their degeneracy; their influence on the youth, on the learned, and on men of rank. Louis the Ninth . . . . .	383
Influence of the mendicant friars in the University of Paris. Checked by Innocent the Fourth (his death); favoured by Alexander the Fourth; attacked by William of St. Amour, who complains of the influence on Louis the Ninth. Papellards and Beguins . . . . .	392
Defence of the mendicant monks by Bonaventura and Thomas. Fate of William of St. Amour. Bonaventura as a censor of his order. The stricter and laxer Franciscans. Joachim's ideas as embraced by this order . . . . .	397

[SECOND DIVISION.]

SECTION THIRD.

*Christian Life and Christian Worship, 406—492.*

General description of Christian life . . . . .	406
Individual traits of Christian life. Ambrose of Siena. Raymond Palmaris. Louis the Ninth. Elizabeth of Hessa	409
Resistance to the secularization of the religious life. Pious societies of the Beghards, Papellards, Boni homines, Boni valeti . . . . .	420
Subjective view of the order of salvation. Justification as the interior work of making just. Fides formata. Twofold error resulting from this view; one-sided externalization, or spiritualization, of religion. Voices of the church-teachers with regard to both errors. Marks of a truly Christian spirit . . . . .	421
Shape given to preaching in the beginning of the twelfth century. Preaching in the spoken languages. Preachers of repentance. Discourse of the abbot Guibert, of Novigentum, on the right method of preaching. Work of Humbert de Romanis, general of the Dominicans, on the education of preachers. Example of pope Innocent the Third. Berthold the Franciscan, a preacher of repentance, at Regensburg and Augsburg . . . . .	434
Attempts to translate the Bible in Germany and France. Bible-reading society at Metz; dissolution of it. The Bible prohibited at the synod of Toulouse, 1229 . . . . .	444
Traces of infidelity, proceeding partly from rudeness of manners, partly from the revival of speculative culture, and especially from the influence of the Arabian philosophy.	

	Page
Frederick the Second. John Sans Terre. John Count of Soissons. Tract of the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy against the latter. Temptations occasioned by religious doubt. Examples of such conflicts . . . . .	450
Dead, worldly faith. Hugo a St. Victore against it. Fanaticism and Superstition. Superstitious veneration of saints. Elfeg of Canterbury. Abuse of relics. Work of Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy, <i>De pignoribus Sanctorum</i> . . . . .	454
Worship of the Virgin Mary. Doctrine of the immaculate conception. Festival of the conception. Bernard of Clairvaux against it. Pothos a monk of Prüm, attacks this festival in his work, "On the State of God's House." Epistolary dispute on this subject betwixt the abbot De la Celle and the English monk Nicholas. Thomas Aquinas, opponent of the exaggerated veneration of Mary. Raymund Lull's defence of the worship of Mary. Festival of the Holy Trinity. Abuses in the observance of festivals. <i>Festum fatuorum, follorum</i> . . . . .	459
The <i>seven</i> sacraments; first mentioned by Otto of Bamberg, 1124. Exposition of the seven sacraments. Doctrine of the eucharist. Confirmation of the doctrine of transubstantiation at the Lateran council, A.D. 1215. Distinction of the accidents remaining behind from the changing substance. Completion of the cultus and entire catholicism in this doctrine. Struggles against it in opinions and doubts of the sectaries. Secret adherents of Berengar. Older intermediate view, taking its departure from the relation of the two natures . . . . .	465
Extreme point of <i>realistic</i> externalization. Thomas Aquinas. Inquiries of Innocent the Third in his treatise <i>De mysteriis missæ</i> ; his and Bonaventura's hypothesis of a retrotransubstantiation. Reply of the University of Paris, on the doctrine of the eucharist, to Clement the Fourth, A.D. 1264. The Dominican John of Paris's revival of the older dogma lying at the bottom of the relation of the two natures. His deposition from his office . . . . .	470
Corpus-Christi day; originated at Liege; instituted first in 1264, by Urban the Fourth; again by Clement the Fifth, in 1311. Introduction of the bowing of the knee before the host, under Innocent the Third; made a law in 1217, by Honorius the Third. Abolition of the communion of infants. Distribution of the eucharist under one form, occasioned by the dread of spilling the blood of Christ; promoted by the idea of the priesthood. Doctrine of concomitance. Contest against the division of the Lord's Supper; division reprobated by Paschalis the Second. Provost Folmar of Traufenstein against concomitance. Neglect of the Lord's Supper by the laity. Ordinance of the Lateran council of 1215 with regard to this point. Encroaching corruption in the celebration of mass . . .	474

Doctrines of penance; necessity of separating the theological	
• doctrine from the notions of the people. Distinctions of	
the theologians between church absolution and the divine	
forgiveness of sins; subjection of this correct sentiment	
under the principles of the church. The three parts of	
penitence, first defined by the Lombards: <i>Compunctio</i>	
<i>cordis</i> ; <i>confessio oris</i> ; <i>satisfactio operis</i> . Extension of	
satisfaction to the future life. Gregory the Seventh.	
Urban the Second against the externals of penitence. In-	
dulgence. Origin of general indulgences, by Victor the	
Third, by occasion of a crusade against the Saracens	
in Africa. Repeated preaching of indulgences during the	
crusades to the holy sepulchre. The council of Clermont	
under Urban the Second. Indulgences placed on a theo-	
retical basis in the thirteenth century. Defence of them	
on the ground of a <i>Thesaurus maritorum</i> and of a supere-	
rogatory perfection of the saints. Distortion of the ori-	
ginal opinion by the sellers of indulgences. Confession of	
William of Auxerre. Thomas Aquinas, Abelard, Stephen	
of Obaize, Berthold the Franciscan, partly against indul-	
gences in general, partly against the abuse of them.	
Papal remissions, and canon of the council of Beziers	
against the latter. Ordinance of oral confession by Inno-	
cent the Third, at the fourth Lateran council . . . .	482



# CHURCH HISTORY.

---

FIFTH PERIOD. FROM GREGORY THE SEVENTH TO BONIFACE THE EIGHTH. FROM THE YEAR 1073 TO THE YEAR 1294.

---

## SECTION FIRST.

### EXTENSION AND LIMITATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

ALREADY, in the preceding period, we took notice of the repeated but unsuccessful attempts to convert the Slavonian tribes living within and on the borders of Germany. Such undertakings, which, without respecting the peculiarities of national character, aimed to force upon the necks of these tribes the yoke of a foreign domination, along with that of the hierarchy, would necessarily prove either a total failure or barren of all salutary influences. The people would struggle, of course, against what was thus imposed on them. Of this sort, were the undertakings of the dukes of Poland to bring the Pommeranians, a nation dwelling on their borders, under their dominion and into subjection to the Christian church. The Poles themselves, as we observed in the preceding period, had been but imperfectly converted, and the consequences of this still continued to be observable in the religious condition of that people; it was the last quarter, therefore, from which to expect any right measures to proceed for effecting the conversion of a pagan nation. Back-Pommerania having been already, a hundred years before, reduced to a condition of dependence on the Poles, Boleslav the Third (Krzywousti) duke of Poland, in the year 1121, succeeded in compelling West Pommerania also, and its regent, duke Wartislav, to acknow-



ledge his supremacy. Eight thousand Pommeranians were removed by him to a district bordering immediately on his own dominions, in order that they might there learn to forget their ancient customs, their love of freedom, and their old religion, and be induced at length to embrace Christianity. But the Polish bishops were neither inclined nor fitted to operate as missionaries in Pommerania; it was much easier, in this period, to find among the monks men who shrunk from no difficulties or dangers, but were prepared to consecrate themselves, with cheerful alacrity, to any enterprise undertaken in the service of the church, and for the good of mankind. The zeal of these good men, however, was not always accompanied with correct views or sound discretion. Often too contracted in their notions to be able to enter into the views and feelings of rude tribes with customs differing widely from their own, they were least of all fitted to introduce Christianity for the first time among a people like the Pommeranians,—a merry, well-conditioned, life-enjoying race, abundantly furnished by nature with every means of a comfortable subsistence, so that a poor man or a beggar was not to be seen amongst them. Having had no experience of those feelings which gave birth to monachism, they could not understand that peculiar mode of life. The monks, in their squalid raiment, appeared to them a mean, despicable set of men, roving about in search of a livelihood. Poverty was here regarded as altogether unworthy of the priesthood; for the people were accustomed to see their own priests appear in wealth and splendour. Hence the monks were spurned with scorn and contempt. Such especially was the treatment experienced by a missionary who came to these parts from the distant country of Spain,—the bishop Bernard.\* Being a native of Spain, he was unfitted

\* This fact is not stated, it is true, in the most trustworthy account we have of this mission, which is contained in the work of an unknown contemporary writer of the life of bishop Otto of Bamberg, published by Canisius, in his *Lectiones antiquæ*, t. iii. p. 51.; but it is reported by the Bambergian abbot Andreas, who wrote in the second half of the fifteenth century. The latter, however, in giving this account, appeals to the testimony of Ulric, a priest in immediate attendance on bishop Otto himself; and what we have said with regard to the missionary efforts of the monks generally, is confirmed at least by the more certain authority of the anonymous writer just mentioned. Speaking of bishop Otto, he says: "*Quia terram Pommeranorum opulentam audiverat et egenos sive men-*

already, by national temperament, to act as a missionary among these people of the north, whose very language it must have been difficult for him to understand. Originally an anchorite, he had lived a strictly ascetic life, when, at the instance of pope Paschalis the Second, he took upon himself a bishopric made vacant by the removal of its former occupant;\* but finding it impossible to gain the love of his community, a portion of whom still continued to adhere to his predecessor, he abandoned the post for the purpose of avoiding disputes, to which his fondness for peace and quiet was most strongly repugnant, choosing rather to avail himself of his episcopal dignity to go and found a new church among the Pommeranians. Accompanied by his chaplain, he repaired to that country: but with a bent of mind so strongly given to asceticism, he wanted the necessary prudence for such an undertaking. He went about barefoot, clad in the garments he was used to wear as an anchorite. He imagined that, in order to do the work of a missionary in the sense of Christ, and according to the example of the Apostles, he must strictly follow the directions which Christ gave to *them*, Matth. x. 9, 10, without considering that Christ gave his directions in this particular form with reference to a particular and transient period of time, and a peculiar condition of things, entirely different from the circumstances of his own field of labour; and so, for the reasons we have alluded to, he very soon began to be regarded by the Pommeranians with contempt. They refrained, however, from doing him the least injury; till, prompted by a fanatical longing after martyrdom, he destroyed a sacred image in Julin, a town situated on the island of Wollin,—a deed which, as it neither contributed to remove idolatry from the hearts of men, nor to implant the true faith in its stead, could only serve, without answering a single good purpose, to irritate the minds of the people. The Pommeranians would no longer

*dicos penitus non habere, sed vehementer aspernari, et jamdudum quosdam servos Dei prædicatores egenos propter inopiam contempsisse, quasi non pro salute hominum, sed pro sua necessitate relevanda, officio insisterent prædicandi."*

\* It was at the time of the schism which grew out of the quarrel betwixt the emperor Henry the Fourth and pope Gregory the Seventh; in which dispute, this deposed bishop may, perhaps, have taken an active part as an opponent of the papal system.

suffer him, it is true, to remain amongst them ; but whether it was that they were a people less addicted to religious fanaticism, than other pagan nations within our knowledge, and Bernard's appearance served rather to move their pity than to excite their hatred and stir them up to persecution ; or whether it was that they dreaded the vengeance of duke Boleslav ; the fact was, they still abstained from all violence to his person, but contented themselves with putting him on board a ship, and sending him out of their country.

Thus, by his own imprudent conduct, bishop Bernard defeated the object of his enterprise ; still, however, he contributed indirectly to the founding of a permanent mission in this country ; and the experience which he had gone through would, moreover, serve as a profitable lesson to the man who might come after him. He betook himself to Bamberg, where the severe austerity of his life, as well as his accurate knowledge of the ecclesiastical reckoning of time, would doubtless give him a high place in the estimation of the clergy. And here he found in bishop Otto a man that took a deep interest in pious enterprises, and one also peculiarly well fitted, and prepared by many of the previous circumstances of his life, for just such a mission.

Otto was descended from a noble, but as it would seem not wealthy Suabian family. He received a learned education, according to the fashion of those times ; but, being a younger son, he could not obtain the requisite means for prosecuting his scientific studies to the extent he desired, and especially for visiting the then flourishing University of Paris, but was obliged to expend all his energies, in the early part of his life, in gaining a livelihood. As Poland, at this time, stood greatly in need of an educated clergy, and he hoped that he should be able to turn his knowledge to the best account in a country that still remained so far behind others in Christian culture, he directed his steps to that quarter, with the intention of setting up a school there. In this employment he soon rose to consideration and influence ; and the more readily, inasmuch as there were very few at that time in Poland who were capable of teaching all the branches reckoned in this period as belonging to a scholastic education. Children were put under his care from many distinguished families, and in this way he came into contact with the principal men of the land. His

knowledge and his gifts were frequently called into requisition by them for various other purposes. Thus he became known to the duke Wartislav Hermann, who invited him to his court, and made him his chaplain.\* When that duke, after having lost his first wife, Judith, began to think of contracting a second marriage, his attention was directed, by means of Otto, to Sophia, sister of the emperor Henry the Fourth; and Otto was one of the commissioners sent, in the year 1088, to the emperor's court, to demand the hand of the princess. The mission was successful, and the marriage took place. Otto was one of the persons who accompanied the princess to Poland; and he thus rose to higher consideration at the Polish court. He was frequently sent on embassies to Germany, and in this way he became better known to the emperor, Henry the Fourth. That monarch finally drew him to his own court, where he made him one of his chaplains, and employed him as his secretary. Otto got into great favour with the emperor.† He appointed him his chancellor, and when the bishopric of Bamberg, in the year 1102, fell vacant, placed him over that diocese. Now it would be very natural to expect that a favourite of the emperor Henry the Fourth, who had obtained through his influence an important bishopric, would therefore be inclined, in the contests between that monarch and pope

\* We follow here the more trustworthy account of the anonymous contemporary. The case is stated differently by the abbot Andreas. According to the latter, Otto made his first visit to Poland in company with the sister of the emperor Henry the Fourth. He calls her Judith, and says that Otto was her chaplain. After her death, according to the same writer, Otto was taken into the service of a certain abbess, at Regensburg, where the emperor became better acquainted with him, and took him into his employment. But Andreas himself confirms the statement of the facts by the anonymous writer, when, after speaking of Otto's appointment to be court-chaplain, he adds: "*Nobiles quique et potentes illius terræ certatim ei filios suos ad erudiendum offerebant.*" Accordingly, the account given by this writer also presupposes that Otto had been master of a school in Poland; and how he came to be so is best explained by the statement of the matter in the anonymous writer, only the later author has fallen into a wrong arrangement of dates.

† Because, as the story went, he was careful to have the psalter always ready for the emperor, who was a great admirer of the Psalms; because he had an extraordinary facility of repeating psalms from memory; and, more than all, because he once presented the emperor with his own cast-off psalter, having first caused it to be repaired, and set off with a very gorgeous binding.

Gregory the Seventh, to espouse the interests of the imperial party ; but Otto was a man too strict and conscientious in his religion to allow himself to be governed in ecclesiastical matters by such considerations. Like the majority of the more seriously disposed clergy, he was inclined to favour the principles of the Gregorian church government. His love of peace and his prudent management enabled him, however, for a while, to preserve a good understanding with both the emperor and the pope ; though at a later period he allowed himself to become so entangled in the hierarchical interest as to be betrayed into ingratitude and disloyalty towards his prince and old benefactor.\*

As a bishop, Otto was distinguished for the zeal and interest which he took in promoting the religious instruction of the people in their own spoken language, and for his gift of clear and intelligible preaching.† He was accustomed to moderate, with the severity of a monk, his bodily wants ; and by this course, as well as by his frugality generally, was able to save so much the more out of the ample revenues of his bishopric for carrying forward the great enterprises which he undertook in the service of the church and of religion. He loved to take from himself to give to the poor ; and all the presents he received from princes and noblemen, far and near, he devoted to the same object. Once, during the season of Lent, when fish were very dear, a large one, of great price, was placed on the table before him. Turning to his steward, said he, "God forbid that I, the poor unworthy Otto, should alone swallow, to-day, such a sum of money. Take this costly fish to my Christ, who should be dearer to me than I am to myself. Take it away to him, wherever thou canst find one, lying on the sick-bed. For me, a healthy man, my bread is enough." A valuable fur was once sent to him as a present, with the request that he would wear it in remembrance of the giver. "Yes," said he, alluding to the well-known words of our Lord, "I will preserve the precious gift so<sup>a</sup> carefully, that neither

\*\*\*

\* See farther on, under the history of the church constitution.

† The anonymous biographer says: "Huic ab omnibus sui temporis pontificibus in docendo populum naturali sermone principatus minime negabatur; quia disertus et naturali pollens eloquio, usu et frequentia in dicendo facill erat, quid loco, quid tempori, quid personis competeret observans."

moths shall corrupt nor thieves break through and steal it,"—so saying, he gave the fur to a poor lame man, then suffering also under various other troubles.\* He distinguished himself by the active solicitude, shrinking from no sacrifice, with which he exerted himself to relieve the sufferings of the needy and distressed, during a great famine, which swept off large numbers of the people. He kept by him an exact list of all the sick in the city where he lived, accompanied with a record of their several complaints, and of the other circumstances of their condition, so as to be able to provide suitably for the wants and necessities of each individual.† He caused many churches, and other edifices, to be constructed for the embellishment, or the greater security, of his diocese. He especially took pleasure in founding new monasteries; for in common with many of the more seriously disposed in his times, he cherished a strong predilection for the monastic life.‡ Governed by the mistaken notion, so common among his contemporaries, that a peculiar sanctity attached itself to the monastic profession, he expressed a wish, when attacked by an illness that threatened to prove fatal, to die in the monkish habit; and, on his recovery, intended actually to fulfil the monkish vow which he had already made in his heart. It was only through the influence of his friends, who represented to him the great importance of his continuing to labour for the good of the church, that he was deterred from executing this purpose.

Such was the man, whom bishop Bernard, on his return from Pommerania, sought to inflame with a desire of prosecuting the mission which he himself had unsuccessfully begun; and he drew arguments from his own experience to convince him that he might confidently hope, if he appeared among the Pommeranians with pomp and splendour, and employed his ample means in the service of the mission, to see his labours crowned very soon with the happiest results.

\* See *Lect. antiq.* l. c. fol. 90.

† The unknown writer says: "*Habebat cognitos et ex nominibus propriis notatos omnes paralyticos, languidos, cancerosos, sive leprosos de civitate sua, modum, tempus, et quantitatem languoris eorum per se investigans congruaque subsidia omnibus providebat et per procuratores.*"

‡ For his views concerning the relation of monasteries to the world, see farther on.

Otto's pious zeal could easily be enkindled in favour of such an object. At this juncture, moreover, came a letter from duke Boleslav of Poland, inviting him in the most urgent terms to engage in the enterprise; whether it was that the duke had been informed how Otto had been led, through Bernard's influence, to entertain the idea of such a mission among the Pommeranians, and now wrote him in hopes of bringing him to a decision—or that this prince, a son of Wartislav by his first marriage, remembering the impression that Otto had made on him when he knew him at the court of his father, felt satisfied that he was the very man to be employed among such a people, the duke earnestly besought him to come to Pommerania. He reminded him of their former connection, whilst he himself was yet a youth, at the court of his father.\* He complained that, with all the pains he had taken for three years, he had been unable to find a person suited for this work among his own bishops and clergy.† He promised that he would defray all the expenses of the undertaking, provide him with an escort, with interpreters, and assistant priests, and whatever else might be necessary for the accomplishment of the object.

Having obtained the blessing of pope Honorius the Second on this work, Otto began his journey on the 24th of April, 1124. Fondly attached as he was to monkish ways, the experience of his predecessor in this missionary field taught him to avoid every appearance of that sort, and rather to present himself in the full splendour of his episcopal dignity. He not only provided himself in the most ample manner with everything that was required for his own support and that of his attendants in Pommerania, but also took with him costly raiment and other articles to be used as presents to the chiefs of the people; likewise all the necessary church utensils by which he could make it visibly manifest to the Pommeranians that he did not visit them from interested motives, but was ready to devote his own property to the object of imparting to them a blessing which he regarded as the very highest.

\* "Quia in diebus juventutis tuæ apud patrem meum decentissima te honestate conversatum memini."

† "Ecce per triennium laboro, quod nullum episcoporum vel sacerdotum idoneorum mihi affinium ad hoc opus inducere queo."

Travelling through a part of Bohemia and Silesia, he made a visit to duke Boleslav in Poland. In the city of Gnesen, he met with a kind and honourable reception from that prince. The duke gave him a great number of waggons for conveying the means of subsistence which he took along with him, as well as the rest of the baggage; a sum of money of the currency of the country to defray a part of the expenses; people who spoke German and Slavic to act as his servants; three of his own chaplains to assist him in his labours; and, finally, in the capacity of a protector, the commandant Paulitzky (Paulicius), a man ardently devoted to the cause. This commandant, or colonel, knew how to deal with the rude people; and he was instructed to employ the authority of the duke for the purpose of disposing the Pommeranians to a readier reception of Christianity. Having traversed the vast forest which at that time separated Poland from Pommerania, they came to the banks of the river Netze, which divided the two districts.\* Here duke Wartislav, who had been apprised of their arrival, came to meet them with a train of five hundred armed men. The duke pitched his camp on the farther side of the river, and then with a few attendants crossed over to the bishop. The latter first had a private interview with the duke and the Polish colonel. As Otto did not possess a ready command of the Slavic language, though he had learned it in his youth, the colonel served as his interpreter. They conferred with each other about the course to be observed in the conduct of the mission. Meantime, the ecclesiastics remained alone with the Pommeranian soldiers, and probably their courage was hardly equal to the undertaking before them. The way through the dismal forest had already somewhat intimidated them; added to which was now the unusual sight of these rude soldiers, clad and equipped after the manner of their country, with whom they were left alone, in a wild uninhabited region, amid the frightful gloom of approaching night. The alarm which they betrayed provoked the Pommeranians, who, though they had been baptized, were perhaps Christians but in name, to work still farther on their fears. Pretending to be pagans, they pointed their swords at them, threatened to

\* According to the statement of Andreaś, the frontier castle where they put up was Uzda, at present Uscz



stab them, to flay them alive, to bury them to their shoulders in the earth, and then deprive them of their tonsure. But they were soon relieved from their great terror by the re-appearance of their bishop in company with the duke, whom, by timely presents, he had wrought to a still more friendly disposition. The example of the duke, who accosted the ecclesiastics in a courteous and friendly manner, was followed by his attendants. They now confessed that they were Christians, and that by their threats they had only intended to put the courage of the ecclesiastics to the test. The duke left behind him servants and guides ; he gave the missionaries full liberty to teach and baptize throughout his whole territory, and he commanded that they should be everywhere received in an hospitable manner.

On the next morning they crossed the borders, and directed their steps to the town of Pyritz. They passed through a district which had suffered greatly in the war with Poland, and was but just recovering from the terrors of it. The much-troubled people were the more inclined therefore to yield in all things to the authority of the bishop, who was enabled, in passing, to administer baptism to thirty in this sparsely-peopled region.

It was eleven of the clock at night when they arrived at Pyritz. They found the whole town awake, for it was a great pagan festival, celebrated with feasting, drinking, song, and revelry ; and four thousand men, from the whole surrounding country, were assembled here on this occasion. Under these circumstances, the bishop did not think it proper to enter the town. They pitched their tents at some distance without the walls, and avoided everything that might attract the attention of the intoxicated and excited multitude. They kept as quiet as possible, not venturing even to kindle a fire. On the next morning, Paulitzky, with the other envoys of the two dukes, entered the town, and called a meeting of the most influential citizens. The authority of the two dukes was here employed to induce the people to compliance. They were reminded of the promise which under compulsion they had before given to the Polish duke, that they would become Christians. No delay was allowed for a more full deliberation on the subject, as they were informed that the bishop, who had forsaken all in order to come and help them, and in the

most disinterested manner devoted himself to their service, was near at hand ; so they yielded, for they supposed their gods had shown themselves unable to help them. When the bishop, with all his waggons and his numerous train, now entered into the town, terror in the first place seized upon all, for they thought it some new hostile attack ; but having convinced themselves of the peaceful intentions of the strangers, they received them with more confidence. Seven days were spent by the bishop in giving instruction ; three days were appointed for spiritual and bodily preparation to receive the ordinance of baptism. They held a fast and bathed themselves, that they might with cleanliness and decency submit to the holy transaction. Large vessels filled with water were sunk in the ground and surrounded with curtains ; behind these baptism was administered, in the form customary at that period, by immersion. During their twenty days' residence in this town, seven thousand were baptized ; and the persons baptized were instructed on the matters contained in the confession of faith, and respecting the most important acts of worship. Before taking his leave of them, the bishop, with the aid of an interpreter, addressed a discourse to the newly baptized from an elevated spot. He reminded them of the vow of fidelity which they had made to God at baptism ; he warned them against relapsing into idolatry ; he explained to them that the Christian life is a continual warfare, and then expounded to them the doctrine of the seven sacraments, since by these were designated the gifts of the Holy Ghost, which were the appointed means of upholding and strengthening the faithful in this warfare. When he spoke of the sacrament of marriage, he explained that those who had hitherto possessed several wives ought from that time to retain but *one* as the lawful wife. He testified his abhorrence of the unnatural custom, which prevailed among the women, of destroying at their birth children of the female sex, when their number appeared too large. As it is evident, however, from the whole history of the affair, that the reception of Christianity was in this case brought about chiefly through the fear of the duke of Poland, —a vast number had submitted to baptism within a very short time, a time altogether insufficient to afford opportunity for communicating the needful instruction to such a multitude,—so it was impossible that what was here done

should as yet be attended with any deep-working or permanent effects.

From this place they proceeded to the town of Kammin. Here resided that wife of duke Wartislav whom he distinguished above all the rest, and whom he regarded as his legitimate consort. She was more devoted to Christianity than she ventured to confess in the midst of a pagan population. Encouraged by what she had heard about the labours of Otto in Pyritz, she declared herself already, before his arrival, more openly and decidedly a friend of Christianity. The bishop, therefore, found the popular mind in a favourable state of preparation; many were anxiously awaiting the arrival of the ecclesiastics, from whom they desired to receive baptism. During the forty days which they spent in this place, their strength was hardly sufficient to administer baptism to as many as demanded it. Meantime, duke Wartislav also arrived at Kammin. He expressed great love for the bishop, and greater zeal in favour of Christianity than he had done before. In obedience to the Christian law of marriage, he took an oath, before the bishop and the assembled people, to remain true to his lawful wife alone, and to dismiss four-and-twenty others whom he had kept as concubines. This act of the prince had a salutary influence on the rest of the people, who followed his example. Here Otto founded the first church for the Pommeranians, over which he appointed one of his clergy as priest, and left him behind for the instruction of the people. A remarkable concurrence of circumstances on one occasion produced a great impression both on the pagans and the new converts. A woman of property, zealously devoted to the old pagan religion, stood forth as a violent opponent of the Christians. She held that the prosperity of the country and its people furnished evidence enough of the power of their ancient deities. On Sunday, when all rested from their labours and repaired to church, this woman required her people, in defiance of the strange god, to work at gathering in the harvest; and, to set the example, went herself into the field and grasped the sickle, but at the first stroke she wounded herself with the instrument. This occurrence was looked upon as a manifest judgment of God—evidence of the power of the God of the Christians.

After having resided here in this manner forty days, the

bishop determined to push his missionary journey still onwards; and two citizens of Pyritz, Domislav, father and son, accompanied them as guides. They directed their steps to one of the principal places of the country, the island of Wollin; but here, on account of the warlike, spiteful character of the inhabitants—a people strongly attached to their ancient customs,—they had reason to expect more determined opposition. The two guides, as they approached the city of Julin, were struck with fear; and the ecclesiastics, as we have seen, were far from being stout hearted men. But bishop Otto himself, amidst such companions, could not catch the contagion of fear. There was nothing to disturb him in the threatening prospect of death. Inclined to err at the opposite extreme, earnestly longing to give up his life in his Saviour's cause, he held danger too much in contempt. It required more self-denial, more self-control on his part, not to throw himself into the midst of the pagan populace, but to try to avert, by wise and prudent measures, the threatening storm. What Otto had done in Pyritz must have been already known in the city, and the zealous devotees to the old Slavic religion could therefore only look upon him as an enemy of their gods. From the fury of the pagan populace, the rude masses of a seafaring people, the worst was to be apprehended. The guides advised that they should remain awhile concealed on the banks of the river, and endeavour to enter the town unperceived by night. In this town, as in the other cities, there was a castle belonging to the duke, attached to which was a strongly-built inclosure, serving as a place of refuge for such as might repair to it. To this place it was proposed that they should remove, with all their goods; thus would they be protected against the first attacks of the infuriate multitude, and, waiting in their place of security until the fury of the people had time to cool, might then come to terms with them. The plan seemed a wise one, and was adopted; but perhaps the peculiar character of the people had not been sufficiently weighed. This plan of stealthily creeping in by night, which betrayed timidity and a want of confidence, might easily lead to serious mischief; whereas, had they come forward openly, they might reckon on the effect which the bishop, appearing in all the pomp of his office, would be likely to produce on the respect of the people for the authority of the Polish duke, and on the gradually-

increasing influence of a secret Christian party ; for there was always to be found in this important seaport and commercial mart, a respectable number of Christian merchants from abroad, by intercourse with whom, as well as with such Christian nations as they visited for the purpose of trade, some few had already, as it seems, been gained over to Christianity.

On the following morning, as soon as they were observed by the people, stormy movements began ; even the asylum was not respected, a furious attack of the populace compelled them to abandon it. The Polish colonel addressed the people, but his words had no effect on the excited multitude. Surrounded by his trembling companions, Otto, undaunted, cheerful, and ready for martyrdom, walked through an angry crowd that threatened death to him in particular, and he received several blows. Knocked down in the press, amid the jostling on all sides, he fell into the mire. Paulitzky, a man of courage and great physical strength, covered him with his own body, and, warding off the blows aimed at his life, helped him to regain his feet. Thus they finally made out to escape unharmed from the city ; but, instead of immediately abandoning this part of the country, they waited five days longer for the people to come to their senses. The secret Christians in the mean time paid a visit to the bishop ; the more respectable citizens also waited on him, to apologise for what had happened, which they said they could not hinder, laying all the blame on the populace. Otto required them to become Christians. Taking advantage of these events to work upon their fears, he threatened them with the vengeance of the Polish duke, whose anger they had good reason to dread, after having offered such an insult to his messengers. He informed them that the only step by which they could hope to pacify the duke, and to ward off the danger which threatened them, was to embrace Christianity. After consulting together, they finally declared that they must be governed by the course taken by their capital town, Stettin, and to this place they advised the bishop to repair first. This advice he followed.

At Stettin, the reception he met with was at first unfavourable. When he proposed to the chief men of the city that they should put away their old religion and adopt Christianity, they repelled the proposition very decidedly. The life and manners of the nations that professed Christianity had brought

it here, as often happens, into discredit. The Pommeranians were now at precisely that point of culture which the apostle Paul, in the seventh of the Epistle to the Romans, describes as a life without the law. Possessing the simplicity, openness, and innocence of primitive manners, and enjoying a degree of temporal prosperity which was the natural result of a favourable climate,\* soil, and location, they were as yet ignorant of the conflicts between law and lust, and of the strifes of contrary interests, and hence exempt from the evils that grow out of them, as well as unconscious of many wants difficult to be satisfied, but very sure to be called forth in a people making the transition from a state of nature to civilization. Fraud and theft were crimes unknown among them; nothing was kept under lock and key.† The hospitality which usually distinguishes a people at this stage of culture existed among them to an eminent degree. Every head of a family had a room especially consecrated to the reception of guests, in which was kept a table constantly spread for their entertainment. Thus the evils were here absent, by which man is made conscious of the sin lurking in his nature, and thereby brought to feel his need of redemption. If physical well-being were man's highest end, they had the best reason for rejecting that which would tear them away from this happy state of nature. Now when, from this point of view, they compared their own condition with that of the Christian nations of Germany, and made up their judgment from the facts which were first presented to them, as they could see nothing to envy in the condition of the latter, so they saw nothing in the religion to which they attributed this condition that could recommend it to their acceptance. Amongst the Christians, said the more respectable citizens of Stettin, are to be found thieves and pirates. Some people have to lose their feet, others their eyes; every species of crime and of punishment abounds amongst them;

\* The unknown author of the Life of Otto, after mentioning the plenty of game, the numerous herds of cattle, the abundance of wheat and of honey, remarks: "Si vitem et oleum et ficum haberet, terram putares esse repromissionis propter copiam fructiferorum."

† "Tanta fides et societas est inter eos, ut furtorum et fraudum penitus inexperti, cistas aut scrinia non habeant serata. Nam seram vel clavem ibi non viderunt, sed ipsi admodum pirati sunt, quod clitellas et scrinia episcopi serata viderunt."

Christian abhors Christian : far from us be such a religion. Still Otto, with his companions, tarried more than two months in Stettin, patiently expecting some change in their determination. As this, however, did not take place, it was concluded to send a message to duke Boleslav of Poland, with a detailed report of the ill success attending the mission. The citizens of Stettin, when they heard of this, were alarmed. They now declared that it was their intention to send with these delegates an embassy of their own to Poland, and, in case they could obtain a solid and permanent peace, together with a diminution of tribute, they were willing on such conditions to embrace Christianity.

In the mean time bishop Otto was not idle. On the market-days, which occurred twice a week, when numbers of country-people came into the town, he appeared in public, dressed in his episcopal robes, with the crosier borne before him, and harangued the assembled multitude on the doctrines of the Christian faith. The pomp in which he appeared, and curiosity to hear what he had to say, drew many around him ; but the faith gained no admittance. He strove first of all, by his own example, the example of a life actuated by the spirit of Christian love, to do away the impression which the citizens of Stettin had received of the Christian faith from looking at the life of the great mass of Christians ; to make it by this means practically evident to them, that there was a still higher principle of life than any which man knows while living in a state of nature, however felicitous in other respects. With his own money he redeemed many captives, and, having provided them with clothes and the means of subsistence, sent them home to their friends. One event, however, contributed in an especial manner to make the pious, benevolent life of the bishop generally known, and to attract towards him the minds of the youth.

Many secret Christians were living even in this part of Pommerania, and among the number of these was a woman belonging to one of the first families in Stettin. Having been carried away captive in her youth from a Christian land, she had married a man of wealth and consideration, by whom she had two sons. Although remaining true to her faith, yet she did not venture, in the midst of a pagan people, to appear openly as a Christian. None the less sincere on that account was her

joy, when bishop Otto came to the city where she lived : these feelings, however, she dared not express aloud, nor to go over to him before the face of the world. Perhaps it was not without the exertion of some influence on her part that her two sons were led to pay frequent visits to the clergy, and to make inquiries of them respecting the Christian faith. The bishop did not fail to make the most of this opportunity, by instructing them, step by step, in all the leading doctrines of Christianity. He found the young men had susceptible minds. They declared themselves convinced, and requested that they might be prepared for baptism. This was done ; and the bishop agreed upon a day, with them, when they should return and receive baptism. They were baptized, with all the accustomed ceremonial of the church, without any knowledge of the transaction on the part of their parents. After this they remained eight days in the bishop's house, in order to observe, with due solemnity, their octave as neophytes. Their mother, in the mean while, got notice of what had been done before the whole time of the octave had expired. Full of joy, she sent a message to the bishop, requesting to see her sons. He received her, seated in the open air on a bank of turf, surrounded by his clergy, the young men at his feet clothed in their white robes. The latter, on beholding their mother at a distance, started up, and bowing to the bishop, as if to ask his permission, hastened to meet her. At the sight of her sons in their white robes of baptism, the mother, who had kept her Christianity concealed for so many years, overcome by her feelings, sunk weeping to the ground. The bishop and his clergy hurried to her in alarm : raising the woman from the earth, they strove to quiet her mind, supposing she had fainted from the violence of her grief. But as soon as she could command herself, and find language to express her feelings, they were undeceived. " I praise thee," were her first words, " Lord Jesus Christ, thou source of all hope and of all consolation, that I behold my sons initiated into thy sacraments, enlightened by the faith in thy divine truth." Then, kissing and embracing her sons, she added : " For thou knowest, my Lord Jesus Christ, that for many years I have not ceased, in the secret recesses of my heart, to recommend these youths to thy compassion, beseeching thee to do in them that which thou now hast done." Next, turning to the bishop, she thus



addressed him :—"Blessed be the day of your coming to this city, for, if you will but persevere, a great church shall here be gathered to the Lord. Do not allow yourselves to grow impatient by any delay. Behold ! I myself, who stand here before you, do, by the aid of Almighty God, encouraged by your presence, reverend father, but also throwing myself on the help of these my children, confess that I am a Christian, a truth which till now I dared not openly acknowledge." She then proceeded to relate her whole story. The bishop thanked God for the wonderful leadings of his grace ; he assured the woman of his hearty sympathy, said many things to strengthen and encourage her in the faith, and presented her with a costly robe of fur. At the expiration of the eight days, when the newly-baptized laid aside their white robes, he made them a valuable present of fine raiment, and, having given them the Holy Supper, dismissed them to go home.

This remarkable occurrence was immediately attended with many important consequences. That Christian woman, who had hitherto kept her religion a secret, now that she had taken the first step and gathered courage, freely and openly avowed her faith, and became herself a preacher of the gospel. Through her influence, her domestics, also her neighbours and friends, and her entire family, were induced to receive baptism. The two young men became preachers to the youth. First, they spoke of the bishop's disinterested love, ever active in promoting the good of mankind ; then of the new, comforting, bliss-conferring truths which they had heard from his lips. The youth flocked to the bishop ; many were instructed and baptized by him. The young became teachers of the old ; and numbers every day presented themselves openly for baptism. But when the father of the two young men who were first baptized came to be informed that his whole family had become Christians, he was exceedingly troubled and indignant at hearing it. The prudent wife, finding that he was returning home in this state of feeling, despatched some of his kinsmen and friends to meet him with comforting and soothing words, while she herself prayed incessantly for his conversion ; and when he got home, and saw so many of his fellow-citizens and neighbours already living as Christians, his opposition gradually gave way, till finally he consented to be baptized himself.

When thus, by influences purely spiritual, the way had been

prepared for the triumph of Christianity and the downfall of paganism in Stettin, the messengers sent to the Polish duke came back, announcing that they had accomplished the object of their mission. The duke, in the very beginning of his letter, proclaimed himself an enemy to all pagans; at the same time he assured them that, if they would abide faithfully by their promise, and embrace Christianity, they might look for peace and amity on a solid foundation; otherwise they must expect to see their territory laid waste by fire and sword, and to experience his eternal enmity. He first reproached them for the rude behaviour which they had shown at the preaching of the gospel; but declared that, notwithstanding all this, yielding to the earnest desires of the ambassador, and especially of bishop Otto, he was determined to forgive them, and to grant them peace on more favourable terms than ever, provided that henceforth they would faithfully observe the conditions they had themselves proposed, and show docility to their religious teachers. The favourable impression produced by this reply was improved to the utmost by the bishop. He proposed at once to the assembled people that, inasmuch as the worship of the true God was incapable of being united with the worship of idols, in order to prepare a dwelling henceforth for the living God, all the monuments of idolatry should be destroyed; but as they still clung to their belief in the reality and power of these gods, and dreaded their vengeance, he with his clergy proposed to go forward and set them the example. Signing themselves with the cross, the true preservative from all evil, and armed with hatchets and pickaxes, they would proceed to demolish all those monuments of idolatry; and if they remained unharmed, it should be a token to all that they had nothing to fear from the gods, but might safely follow the example he had given them.

This was done. The first monument destroyed was a temple dedicated to the Slavic god Triglav, containing an image of that divinity, and decorated on its inner walls with various works of sculpture and paintings in oil. In this temple were many precious articles; for the tenth part of all the spoils obtained in war was consecrated to this deity, and deposited here. Abundance of costly offerings were here to be found; goblets of horn ornamented with precious stones, golden bowls, knives, and poniards of beautiful workmanship. All these articles

it was proposed to give to the bishop ; but he declined receiving them. " God forbid," said he, " that we should think of enriching ourselves out of what belongs to you. Such things as these, and still more beautiful, we have already at home." Then, after having sprinkled them with holy water and signed them with the cross, he caused them to be distributed among the people. With this proof of a disinterested love, that avoided the very appearance of selfishness, bishop Otto manifested also a singular liberality of Christian spirit, in refusing to give up to destruction that which, innocent in itself, might be devoted to better uses for the benefit of mankind. The only gift he consented to receive was the image of Triglav ; of which, causing the rest of the body to be destroyed, he preserved the triple head as a trophy of the victory obtained over idolatry. This he afterwards sent to Rome, in evidence of what he had done as a missionary of the Roman Church, for the destruction of paganism. Three other buildings were next demolished, temples\* erected to idols where the people were accustomed to meet for their sports and carousals, as well as for deliberation on more serious matters. In destroying or removing the monuments of the old idolatry, and everything connected with it, Otto did not, with heedless fanaticism, treat all cases alike, but was governed in his mode of procedure by a prudent regard to circumstances. It was an important point to distinguish between those objects which, by constantly furnishing some point of attachment for the old pagan bent, would serve to keep it alive, and others where nothing of this kind was to be feared. In the vicinity of each of those buildings dedicated to the gods was to be found one of those ancient oaks, regarded everywhere in Germany with religious veneration, and beside it a fountain. The citizens besought the bishop that these oaks might be spared. They promised to withhold from them all associations of a religious character. They simply wished to enjoy the pleasant shade and other amenities of these chosen spots ; which indeed was no sin, and he complied with their request. Among other objects, however, there was a horse considered sacred, which in times of war was employed for purposes of divination.† In demanding the removal of all

\* Concinae.

† Nine javelins, each an ell long, were placed in a row. The horse was then led over them, and if he passed without touching one of them,

such objects, Otto was inexorably severe ; he would not allow one of them to remain, since he was aware of the influence which these superstitious were still wont to exert even long after the destruction of paganism. He insisted, therefore, that the sacred horse should be sent into another country and sold. Notwithstanding these decided measures for the extirpation of paganism, not a man had the boldness to stand forth in its defence, except the priest whose business it was to tend and manage the sacred horse ; but the sudden death of this man, who had stood up alone for the honour of the gods, was favourably construed as a divine judgment. After the temples had been destroyed, the people were admitted to baptism ; and the same order was observed here as at Pyritz, numbers presenting themselves at a time, and receiving the ordinance, after a discourse had been preached to them on the doctrines of faith. Having tarried here five months in the whole, Otto departed from Stettin, leaving behind him a church with a priest.

From Stettin, he visited a few of the places belonging to the territory of that city.\* He then went by water down the Oder, and across the Baltic sea, to Julin. The inhabitants of this town having agreed with the bishop that they would follow the example of the capital city, had already sent persons to Stettin, for the purpose of obtaining exact information respecting the manner in which the gospel was there received. The news they obtained could not fail to make the most favourable impression ; and Otto was received in Julin with demonstrations of joy and respect. The activity of the clergy during the two months which they spent in this place, scarcely sufficed to baptize all who offered themselves. After the Christian church had thus been planted in the two chief cities of Pommerania, the question rose where should the first bishopric be founded. Otto and duke Wartislav agreed that Julin was the most suitable place to be made the first seat of a bishopric for Pommerania ; partly because this city was so situated as to form a convenient central point, and partly because the rude people

this was considered a favourable omen. Horses were held sacred also amongst the ancient Germans, especially for the purpose of prophecy. Vid. Tacit. German., c. x. ; Grimm's Deutsche Mytholog., s. 878, u. d. f.

\* The unknown author mentions two castles, Graticia and Lubinum, the first Garz, the second Lebbehn, according to the probable conjecture of Kanngiesser. See his Geschichte von Pommern, p. 660.

here, inclined by nature to be refractory and insolent, and peculiarly exposed to the infection of paganism, especially needed the constant presence and oversight of a bishop.\* Two churches were here begun. From this place Otto went to a city called Clonoda, or Clodona,† where, taking advantage of the abundance of wood, he erected a church;‡ next, he proceeded to a city which had suffered extremely by the ravages attending the war with Poland;§ and from thence to Colberg. Many of the inhabitants of this place were now absent on voyages of traffic to the coasts of the Baltic sea, and those that remained at home were unwilling to make a decision till a general assembly could be holden of all the people; the bishop, however, finally succeeded in inducing them to receive baptism. The city of Belgrade was the extreme point of his missionary tour. It became necessary for him to reserve the extending of the mission to the remaining parts of Pommerania for a future day, as the affairs of his own diocese now called him home; but first, he felt bound to make a visitation-tour to the communities already founded by him, and bestow confirmation on those who had before been baptized. Many whom he had not met with on his first visit, being then absent on voyages of trade, now presented themselves for baptism. The churches, whose foundations he had laid during his first residence in these districts, had in the mean time been completed, and he was enabled to consecrate them. The Christian Pommeranians now besought him, the beloved founder of their churches, to remain with them himself, and be their bishop; but he could not consent. Having spent a year lacking five weeks in Pommerania, he hastened back, that he might be with his flock at the celebration of Palm-Sunday. He directed his course once more through Poland, where he met duke Boleslav, and reported to him the successful issue of his enterprise. As Otto could not hold the first bishopric himself, Boleslav nominated to this post Adalbert, one of his chaplains, who by his directions had accompanied

\* "Ut gens aspera ex jugi doctoris præsentia mansuesceret," says Otto's companion.

† According to Kanngiesser's interpretation, *Gollnow*.

‡ "Quia locus nemorosus erat et amœnus et ligna ad ædificandum suppetebant."

§ Kanngiesser makes it probable, from the name and situation, that this place was *Naugard*.

bishop Otto as an assistant. Otto himself left several priests in Pommerania to prosecute the work which had been commenced, but they were too few in number to complete the establishment of the Christian church; nor was it likely that any of them would possess the ardour and courage of their leader. As the time he was able to pass in the several places was comparatively so short; as he was obliged to employ an interpreter in his intercourse with the people; as political motives had co-operated, at least in the case of many, to procure their conversion; so it may readily be conceived that this conversion of great masses was very far from being a permanent and thorough work.

The Christian worship of God having now been introduced into one half of Pommerania, whilst paganism reigned in the other, the necessary result was, that a striking contrast presented itself between the two portions; and the example of ancient customs, of the popular festivals of paganism, its amusements and its carousals among the pagans, might easily entice back the others again into their former habits. They would yearn after their old unconstrained, national mode of life. The restrictions under which Christianity and the church, with its laws concerning fastings, laid their untutored nature, might be felt by them as an intolerable yoke, which they longed to exchange for the enjoyment of their ancient freedom; and thus it might happen that, in the districts where Otto had laid the foundation of the Christian church, the pagan party would again lift up its head, and paganism begin once more to extend its empire. Such fluctuations in the conflict between Christianity and paganism—as in the early history of Christianity, which, having made rapid progress at first, immediately encountered a strong reaction of paganism—are often found recurring in the history of missions. We may mention, as an example furnished by the modern history of missions, the mission among the Society Islands of Australia.

Gladly would Otto have gone earlier to the help of the new church in its distress; but various public misfortunes, and the political affairs in which he became involved as an estate of the German empire, prevented him, for full three years, from fulfilling his wish. It was not till the spring of the year 1128, that he could visit the field in person; but to avoid laying any further burden on the dukes of Poland and

Bohemia, he now chose another route, which had been made practicable by the subjugation of the Slavic populations, in those districts. He directed his journey through Saxony, Priegnitz, and the territories which were reckoned as belonging to Leuticia, to the adjacent parts of Pommerania. He determined also, in this second mission, to defray all his personal expenses, and those of his attendants, out of his own purse, and to take with him a large number of valuable presents. To this end he purchased, in Halle, a quantity of grain and other merchandise, intended for presents, all of which he placed on board vessels, to be conveyed by the Saale to the Elbe and Havel, after which the lading was conveyed onward by fifty waggons. He arrived first at a part of Pommerania where the gospel had not yet been preached, and entering the city of Demmin, found but one old acquaintance in the person of the governor. Here, on the next day, he met his old friend, duke Wartislav. The duke was on his return, laden with spoils, from a successful war with the neighbouring Leuticians. Many sights were here presented to the eyes of Otto, which could not fail to make a very painful impression on his benevolent heart. The army of the duke had brought away a number of captives; these were to be divided in common with the rest of the booty. Among them were to be found many persons of weak and delicate constitutions. Husbands were to be separated from their wives, wives from their husbands, parents from their sons. The bishop interceded with the duke in their behalf, and persuaded him to liberate the weakest, and not to separate near kinsmen and relatives from each other; but, not satisfied with this, he paid from his own funds the ransom-money for many who were still pagans. These he instructed in Christianity, baptized, and then sent back to their homes. Otto and the duke showed every kindness to each other, and exchanged presents. They agreed that, on Whitsuntide, now close at hand, a diet should be held at Usedom, with a view to induce the several states to consent to, and take an active part in, the establishment of the Christian church. In the letter-missive, it was expressly announced, that the errand of bishop Otto was to preach the Christian religion, and that this was the subject to be brought before the diet. Otto next laded a vessel on the river Peene, with all his goods, which thus after three days arrived at Usedom. He

himself, however, with a few attendants, proceeded leisurely along the banks of the Peene to that city, taking advantage of this jaunt to prepare the way, wherever he went, for the preaching of the gospel.

In Usedom he found there were already some scattered seeds of Christianity, conveyed there by the priests he had left behind him. Still more was done by himself. At this place the deputies of the States, in obedience to the summons of the duke, now came together, composed partly of such as had always remained pagans and partly of those who had been previously converted, but during Otto's absence had relapsed into paganism. The duke presented to them the bishop,—a man whose whole appearance commanded respect. In an impressive discourse, in which he invited them to set their people the example of embracing the worship of the true God, he bade them remark that the excuse they had always offered would no longer avail them, namely, that the preachers of this religion were a needy, contemptible set of men, in whom no confidence could be placed, and who pursued this business merely to get a living. Here they beheld one of the highest dignitaries of the German empire, who at home possessed every thing in abundance,—gold, silver, precious stones; a man on whom no one could fix a suspicion that he sought anything for himself; who, on the contrary, had relinquished a life of honour and of ease, and applied his own property to the object of communicating to them that treasure which he prized as the highest good. These words had their effect; and the whole assembly declared themselves ready to pursue any course which the bishop might propose to them. The latter now began; and, taking occasion from the festival of Whitsuntide, spoke of the grace and goodness of God, of the forgiveness of sin, and of the communication of the Holy Ghost and his gifts. His words made a profound impression; the apostates professed repentance, and the bishop reconciled them with the church. Those who had always been pagans, suffered themselves to be instructed in Christianity, and submitted to baptism. A decree of the diet permitted the free preaching of the gospel in all places. Otto was occupied here a whole week. He then concluded to extend his labours still farther, and asked the advice of the duke. The latter declared that, by virtue of the decree of the diet, the whole country stood open



to him. The bishop now commenced sending his clergy, two by two, into all the towns and villages, intending to follow them himself.

But although the decree of the diet possessed the validity of a law, yet such was not the character and spirit of the people that obedience would necessarily follow in all cases. There were important old cities who maintained a certain independence; and in many districts the ancient popular religion had a powerful party in its favour, who were dissatisfied with this decree. Among these cities was the town of Wolgast, a place to which bishop Otto had determined to go first. A priest lived here who for a year had made it his business to resist the spread of Christianity, to excite against it the hatred of the people, and to enkindle their zeal for the honour of their ancient deities; though he had been unable as yet to procure the passage of a public decree in reference to these matters. But now, when the diet had passed a decree so favourable for the diffusion of Christianity, this priest thought himself bound to make a final effort to carry out by fraud and cunning what he could not accomplish by persuasion. Repairing by night, in his sacerdotal robes, to a neighbouring forest, he concealed himself on a hill, in the midst of a thicket of brush-wood. Early the next morning, a peasant passing along the road on his way to the city, heard a voice call out to him from the dark forest, and bid him stop and listen. Already terrified at the voice, he was still more amazed at beholding a figure clothed in white. The priest, following up the impression, represented himself as the highest of the national gods, who had chosen here to make his appearance. He signified his anger at the reception which the worship of the strange God had met with in the country, and bade the man say to the inhabitants of the city, that the man must not be allowed to live who should attempt to introduce among them the worship of that strange God. When the credulous peasant came to tell his story in the city, the priest who had played this trick first put on the air of a sceptic, with a view to draw out the peasant into a new and more detailed account of what he had seen and heard, so as to avail himself of the fresh impression of the story. Such was the effect produced by it on the popular mind, that the citizens passed a decree, ordaining that if the bishop or any of his associates entered the city, they should instantly be put

to death, and that any citizen who harboured them in his house should suffer the like punishment.

These events had transpired, and such was the tone of the popular feeling, when the two missionaries sent before him by the bishop, Ulric and Albin,—the latter of whom, possessing a ready knowledge of the Slavic language, was commonly employed by him as an interpreter,—arrived at Wolgast, without dreaming of the danger to which they exposed themselves. Conformably to the Pommeranian manners, they met with an hospitable reception from the wife of the Burgomaster, a woman who, though not a Christian, was distinguished for a reverence quite free from fanaticism towards the unknown God, as well as for her active philanthropy. But when, after being entertained by the woman, they proceeded to explain who they were, and the object of their visit, she was struck with consternation, and informed them of the danger to which they were exposed; still, she was determined to observe faithfully the laws of hospitality. She pointed the strangers to a place of concealment in an upper part of her house, and caused their baggage to be quickly conveyed to a place of safety, beyond the walls of the city. It is true, the arrival of the strangers whom she entertained soon awakened suspicion among the excited multitude; but as the practice of hospitality to strangers was so common a thing in Pommerania, she found no difficulty in evading the questions of the curious, declaring that strangers were indeed entertained by her, as oftentimes before, but that, after taking their repast, they had left her; and as the persons who inquired saw no signs of their being still in the house, they gave up their suspicions.

The account of these movements had already reached Usedom, and the duke, therefore, thought it advisable to accompany the bishop to Wolgast with a large band of followers, among whom were some of the members of the diet, and several armed soldiers. Three days had been spent by the two ecclesiastics in their place of concealment, when by the arrival of so powerful a protector they felt themselves perfectly safe, and at liberty to emerge from their retreat. The bishop, thus sustained, was enabled to commence the preaching of the gospel. But when the authority of the duke had restored quiet in the city, and the pagan party was forced to keep still, a feeling of security took possession of some of the ecclesiastics. They

ridiculed the two priests, when they spoke of their narrow escape. They separated from the bishop and the rest of the company, despising prudence as no better than cowardice. Mingling fearlessly among the people, they attempted to slip into the temple. By this act, however, the fury of the pagans was stirred up afresh ; especially as the suspicion got abroad that they were seeking an opportunity to set fire to the temple. Troops of armed people began to assemble. The priest Ulric, perceiving these signs of an impending tumult, said : " I shall not consent to tempt my God so often," and returning back to the bishop, he was followed by all the others except one ecclesiastic, named Encodric, who had advanced too far, and already had his hand on the door of the temple. The pagans now rushed upon him in a body, intending to make him the victim of their common vengeance against the whole party. Seeing no other place of refuge, urged by the fear of immediate death, he penetrated into the inmost parts of the temple ; and this desperate movement is said to have saved him. Suspended in this temple was a shield, wrought with great art and embossed with gold, dedicated to Gerovit, the god of war, which was regarded as inviolably sacred, and supposed to render the person of him who bore it also inviolable. As the ecclesiastic, flying for his life, ran round the temple looking for a weapon of defence or a place of concealment, he descried this shield, and seizing it, sprang into the midst of the furious crowd. Everybody now fled before him ; not a man dared lay hands on him ; and thus, running for his life, he got safely back to his companions. The bishop took occasion from this incident to exhort his clergy to greater caution. He continued his labours in this place until the people had demolished all their temples, and the foundation was laid of a church, over which he set one of his clergy as the priest.

Without being accompanied by the duke, who probably had hastened to his assistance solely on account of the occurrences at Wolgast, Otto proceeded to Gützkow. It agreed alike with his temperament and his principles to accomplish the whole work before him by no other power than that of love, which wins the heart. He never made any use of his political connections except for the purpose of securing himself, in the first place, against the fury of the pagans. It was certainly most gratifying to him whenever he found he could

dispense with the arm of secular power. Having left the duke free to attend to his own affairs, he felt more at liberty to decline the proposition of his old friend the Margrave Albert of Bären, afterwards founder of Mark Brandenburg, who, on being informed of the popular movements at Wolgast, offered by his envoys, that met the bishop at Gützkow, to assist him against the obstinate pagans. In Gützkow, Otto would have found easier access to the hearts of the people, had he consented to spare a new and magnificent temple, which, considered as a work of art, was reckoned a great ornament to the city. Magnificent presents were offered to him, if he would yield. Finally, he was entreated to convert this temple into a Christian church, as had been done aforetime; but the bishop, who, not without reason, feared the consequences which would result from any mixture of Christianity with paganism, believed it inexpedient, indulgent as he was in other respects, to give way in this instance; and by a comparison drawn from the parables of our Lord, he endeavoured to make the people understand that he could not, in consistency with their own good, comply with their wishes. "Would you think," said he to the petitioners, "of sowing grain among thorns and thistles? No; you would first pluck up the weeds, that the seed of the wheat might have room to grow. So I must first remove from the midst of you everything that belongs to the seed of idolatry, those thorns to my preaching, in order that the good seed of the gospel may bring forth fruit in your hearts to the everlasting life." And by such representations, daily repeated, he finally overcame the resistance of these people, so that with their own hands they destroyed the temple and its idols. But, on the other hand, to indemnify the people for the loss of their magnificent building, he zealously pushed forward the erection of a stately church; and as soon as the sanctuary with the altar was finished, seized upon this occasion, since he could not remain among them till the entire structure was finished, of appointing a splendid festival for its dedication; one which should outshine all their previous pagan celebrations, and be a true national festival. When nobles and commoners were all assembled at this celebration, and the whole ceremonial of the church, customary on such occasions, had been solemnly observed, he proceeded to explain to the assembled multitude the symbolical meaning of these observ-

ances, and, directing their attention from the outward signs to the inner substance, warned them against the delusive supposition that the requisitions of Christianity could be satisfactorily met by mere outward forms. He laboured to make it plain to them that the highest meaning of the consecration of a church had reference to the consecration of God's temple in the soul of every believer, since Christ dwells, by faith, in the hearts of the faithful; and after having thus interpreted the several observances, he turned to one of the duke's vassals, Mizlav, the governor of this district, who had been a member of the assembly of the states lately holden at Usedom, had then been baptized by him, and, as the sequel shows, made an honest profession of Christianity. For the purpose of bringing out in him the truth which each man was to apply to himself, said he, "Thou art the *true* house of God, my beloved son. Thou shalt this day be consecrated and dedicated—consecrated to God, thy Almighty Creator; so that, separated from every foreign master, thou mayest be exclusively his dwelling and his possession: therefore, my beloved son, do not hinder this consecration. For little avails it to have outwardly consecrated the house thou seest before thee, if a like consecration be not made in thy own soul also." The bishop here paused, or perhaps Mizlav interrupted him.\* At any rate Mizlav, who felt these words, of which he well understood the import, enter like a goad into his soul, demanded what then was required on his part in order to such a consecration of God's temple within him. The bishop, plainly perceiving by this question that the man's heart was touched by the Spirit of God, resolved to profit by so favourable an indication; and, to follow up the leadings of the divine prompter, replied: † "In part thou hast begun already, my son, to be a house of God. See that thou art *wholly* so. For thou hast already exchanged idolatry for faith by attaining to the grace of baptism. It remains that thou shouldst adorn faith by works of piety." And he required, in particular, that he should renounce and abandon all deeds of violence, all rapa-

\* In the MSS., l. c. iii. c. 9. f. 79, Canis. Lect. antiq. ed. Basnage, iii. 2, there is to be found in this place a slight deficiency which leaves the meaning uncertain.

† This is what the biographer doubtless intended to denote by the words, 'Intelligens adesse Spiritum Sanctum.'

city, oppression, fraud, and shedding of blood. He exhorted him to adopt the words of our Lord as his rule, never to do unto others otherwise than he would be done by. And that he might carry out this rule into immediate practice, he called upon him to set at liberty those persons whom he had confined for debt, and who were now pining in prison, or at least such of them as were of the same household of faith. To this Mizlav replied: "What you require of me is extremely hard, for many of those persons are owing me large sums of money." Upon this, the bishop reminded him of the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." Only then would he be certain of receiving the forgiveness of his sins from the Lord, when he felt ready, in the name of the Lord, to release all his debtors. "Well, then," said Mizlav, deeply sighing, "I do here, in the name of the Lord Jesus, give them all their liberty; that so, according to your words, my sins may be forgiven, and the consecration of which you spoke may be perfected in me this day." This act of Mizlav spread joy all around, and an additional interest was thus given to the festival. There was one prisoner, however, of whom Mizlav had said nothing. A nobleman of Denmark, owing him five hundred pounds of gold, had given his son as a security; and this young man, bound in fetters, lay pining in a subterranean cell. A mere accident led to the discovery of him—the only individual who had not been set free. One of the vessels needed for the consecration of the church was missing, and the ecclesiastics, while searching for it in one corner and another, at length came upon the cell where this youth lay confined. He implored them to help him; but as Mizlav had already done so much, the bishop felt unwilling to demand of him this final sacrifice. Still it distressed him to think that so joyful a festival should be saddened by the sufferings of one unfortunate being. He first resorted to prayer, and fervently besought the Almighty that, to crown the joy of this blessed festival, he would have compassion on the case of this only unhappy individual. Then, setting before his clergy how he had already obtained so many self-denying acts from Mizlav that he did not feel at liberty to press him any farther, he proposed that they should speak to him; and, after assuring him that the bishop knew how to appreciate the sacrifices he had already made, introduce the

subject with all possible gentleness. This was done; and Mizlav finally declared that he was ready to offer this last and most difficult sacrifice. "Nay," said he to the bishop, "I am ready, if required, to give up my person, and all that I call mine, for the name of my Lord Jesus Christ." The example of the principal man of the district had its effect on many others, who strove, according to their means, to evince in like manner the genuineness of the change they had experienced.

Subsequent to these events, bishop Otto endeared himself to the Pommeranians by his exertions to save them from a great public calamity; for it was by his intervention that a military expedition, threatened by duke Boleslav of Poland, who had become irritated by the apostacy of a part of the Pommeranians from Christianity, and by their neglect to fulfil certain articles of an old treaty, was prevented. Soon after, he had a conference with duke Wartislav at Usedom, probably for the purpose of reporting his transactions with the duke of Poland, and also of advising with him about the policy of extending the missionary operations and establishing some new stations. In regard to this matter, however, animated as he certainly was by an ardent zeal for the cause of Christ, he still failed to act with apostolic prudence: for notwithstanding that the work in Pommerania went on at present so prosperously, and everything depended on taking advantage of favourable circumstances; and notwithstanding so much still remained for him to do here, he thought of abandoning the field before he had fully taken possession of it, or provided for its permanent occupation, to go in quest of another, which promised less success, and which might easily prove the means of bringing all his earthly labours to a sudden termination. His eye had fixed itself eagerly on the island of Rügen, about a day's journey distant; and an earnest longing beset him to appear amongst the inhabitants of that island, a small warlike tribe zealously devoted to heathenism, and preach to them the gospel. The spread of Christianity among their neighbours, the Pommeranians, had roused the animosity of the pagan people on the island of Rügen to a more extravagant pitch, and they threatened death to the bishop if he ventured to approach them. Otto was not to be deterred, however, by such threats from

attempting the expedition; on the contrary, his zeal was inflamed to exhibit the power of faith in overcoming such difficulties, and even to offer up his life for the gospel. In vain did the duke and his own friends declare themselves opposed to the scheme, assuring him that he would, by attempting it, sacrifice his life for nothing—a life he was bound to preserve for labours that promised more success. Otto gave way, in this instance, to the impulse of his feelings, instead of listening to the voice of reason; but in his own opinion he reasoned more correctly than his friends, whom he rebuked for their want of faith. “It is a much greater thing,” said he, “to preach by actions than by words. And suppose we were *all* to give up our lives for the faith, yet even our death would not be useless; by so dying we should set our seal to the faith which we preach, and that faith would spread with the greater power.” While his friends strove to prevent Otto from crossing over to Rügen, he himself was occupied in devising some way of getting to the island unobserved. It was necessary, therefore, to watch him closely. But whilst the rest of the clergy blamed the rash zeal of their bishop, the priest Ulric felt himself impelled to realize the darling thought of his superior. Having first begged and received his blessing on the undertaking, Ulric went on board a ferry-boat, taking with him such articles as were necessary for the celebration of the mass. But wind and weather were obstinately against him—three several times he was beaten back by the storm; yet no sooner did it remit its violence than he again attempted to get over to the island. Thus he struggled with the winds and waves for seven days, many times hovering between life and death; but the weather constantly proving unfavourable, and Ulric’s boat getting to be leaky, the bishop at length began to regard these unpropitious events as indications of the divine will, and forbade his beloved priest from making any farther attempts. The dangers he had run now became the subject of remark. Said one, “Suppose Ulric had perished, who would have been to blame for it?” Here the priest Adalbert spoke out, plainly criminating the bishop himself. “Would not the blame,” said he, “justly fall on him who exposed him to such dangers?”—showing not only his own independent spirit, but also the gentleness of the bishop, which would allow one of his clergy to speak so frankly about him in his own presence.



sence. Otto, instead of taking the remark unkindly, endeavoured to refute the implied charge by arguing that he had done rightly, though on such grounds as he would not have offered except under the influence of his present feelings. Said he, "If Christ sent the apostles as sheep among wolves, was Christ to be blamed if the wolves devoured the sheep?"

That he might, in the shortest time, extend out his labours in all directions, so as to fill up and complete the whole work begun during his first residence in Pommerania, Otto determined to alter his plan; and, instead of keeping all his clergy about him, as at first, and labouring in common with them from a single point, to divide the field between them and himself by sending them to different stations. Some he sent to Demmin; he himself went to Stettin, to combat the paganism which had again lifted up its head there. But his clergy neither entered heartily into his plan nor partook of his courageous faith: they trembled at the fury of the pagan people in that place, and were not willing to expose their lives. The bishop, however, since he could not overcome their opposition by exhortation, resolved to proceed on the journey alone. Having spent a day in solitude and prayer, to prepare himself for the undertaking, he stole away in the evening, as soon as it grew dark, taking with him his mass-book and the sacramental cup. The clergy knew nothing about it till they sent to call him to matins (the *matutina*). Finding that he was gone, they were struck with shame, and began to grow alarmed for their beloved spiritual father. They hurried away after him, and compelled him to return back. On the next morning they set out in company with him, and crossed over by ship to Stettin.

In Stettin Otto's earlier labours had proved by no means fruitless. This appeared evident from the events which followed. A reaction of those Christian convictions which had already been deeply implanted in the minds of many, led, under a variety of peculiar circumstances and favourable coincidences, to a new triumph of Christianity over paganism. Christianity, as it seems, had gained entrance especially among the higher and more cultivated class of the people,\* and in

\* The Sapientiores, as distinguished from the people, a class frequently alluded to by the unknown writer of Otto's life.

their case paganism found, at its revival, but little matter to work upon. The priests, however, who had submitted to baptism were still pagans at heart, and they lost too much by the change of religion to get easily over the pain and vexation which that loss occasioned : they readily found means of operating on the rude masses of the people, in whom, during so short a period, Christianity had not yet struck its roots deep. A famine, extending to men and cattle, accompanied with unusual mortality, was interpreted by them as a sign of the anger of the deities—a thing easily made evident to the people. They managed, such was their influence, to carry the matter so far that a mob assembled to destroy a Christian church. Yet there were some who had felt the power of Christianity, though they had not entirely loosened their hold of paganism. In this class there was a struggle between the old and the new, or a commingling of both.

Before the time of Otto's second visit to Stettin, there was residing in that town a person of some note, who, after having experienced various remarkable providences in the course of his life, stood forth as a zealous witness for Christianity, thus preparing the way by his influence for a better state of things. Witstack was one of those belonging to the more consequential class of citizens who had been converted and baptized by Otto ; and although Christianity was by no means apprehended by him according to its pure spirit, yet he had within him the germ of a strong and vigorous faith. The image of bishop Otto, the man whom he had seen labouring with such self-denying love, such unshaken confidence in God, this image seems especially to have become deeply stamped on his mind. Since his conversion, he had uniformly refused to take part in any warlike undertaking, except *against pagans*. Fighting against these was one way, as he thought, by which he could show his zeal for Christianity. He joined a piratical expedition, probably against the Rugians ; experiencing a defeat, he, with others, was taken captive and thrown in chains. During his confinement, he resorted for consolation and support to prayer. Once, after long-continued, earnest prayer, falling asleep, he dreamed that bishop Otto appeared to him, and promised that he should be assisted ; soon after which, by a remarkable turn of Providence, he found means of escaping

from his confinement.\* Hastening to the sea-shore, he found a boat, leaping on which he committed himself to the waves, and, favoured by the wind, in a short time got safely back to Stettin. He looked upon his deliverance as a miracle: it seemed to him a direct testimony to Otto's holiness—a proof that Christianity was the cause of God. He regarded it as a divine call, inviting him to appear as a witness among his countrymen for the Being who had miraculously saved him, and to labour for the extension of his worship among them.† After his return, he caused the boat to be hung up at the city gates, as a lasting memorial of his deliverance and testimony in favour of the Being to whom he owed it. With great zeal he bore witness among his countrymen of the God whom bishop Otto had taught him to pray to, and whose almighty power had been so clearly exhibited in his own case: he announced to the fallen the divine judgments, which would surely overtake them unless they repented and returned back to the faith.

Still another fact, which was likewise regarded as a miracle, had made a favourable impression. In a popular tumult, got up for the purpose of destroying the church which had been erected in that town, it so happened that one of the persons actively engaged in the affair, when about to strike a blow with his hammer, was seized with a sudden palsy; his hand

\* The account by the unknown writer, whom we follow here also, is certainly deserving of credit in its main points. We find, for the most part, in it that graphical mode of description which bespeaks an eye-witness, a simplicity quite remote from the exaggerated style of Andreas, few miraculous stories, and these, for the most part, of such a character that the facts at bottom may be easily separated from the mode of apprehending and representing them as miracles, or that they may be easily reduced to a natural connection of events of the higher sort. But, in this case, the report refers back to the saying of Witstack. In this report, drawn up from recollection long after the events, everything, in the lively feeling of gratitude to God, might receive a colouring of the wonderful. But we are by no means authorised to measure all extraordinary psychological phenomena by the standard of ordinary experience, and the objective fact as it actually occurred ever lies at bottom of the representation.

† The historian already mentioned records the following words of Witstack to the bishop, in reference to the boat which was the means of his salvation: "*Hæc cimba tēstimonium sanctitatis tuæ, firmamentum fidei meæ, argumentum legationis meæ ad populum istum.*"

stiffening, let the hammer drop, and he himself fell from the ladder. It seems that he was one of the relapsed Christians. Perhaps a reaction of the faith, not yet by any means wholly extinguished in his soul, once more came over him ; hence an inward struggle, a sudden access of fear, which palsied his arm, as he was about to join with the rest in destroying a temple consecrated to the God of the Christians. Paganism, it is true, still maintained a place in his soul ; he could not wholly renounce the worship of the ancient gods ; but still, the God of the Christians, whose temple was being destroyed, appeared to him as one against whom no human power could prevail, as was manifest in his own case. He therefore advised that, in order to preserve friendship with all the gods, they should erect by the side of this church an altar to the national divinities. Now, even this was something gained ; it was a point in advance, that the God of the Christians should be recognized by pagans themselves as a mighty being beside the ancient gods.

Thus, after such preparatory events, Otto's arrival at Stettin fell at the right moment to bring the contest between Christianity and paganism, aroused by the influence of Witstack, to a more open outbreak and final decision. However great his danger might seem, when men contemplated from without the rage of the pagan mass of the population, yet it would appear by no means so great to him who could more closely examine, on the very scene of events, the circumstances of the case ; for although the pagan party, which was made up, for the most part, of people of the lower class, were loud in their vociferations, and violent in their gestures, yet the Christian party, with whom the better class of citizens seem to have tacitly arranged themselves, was really the most powerful ; nor were they destitute of the means of restoring quiet, provided only the first gust of anger, in which there was more noise than efficiency, was suffered to pass by. Besides, the pagan party had no leader combining superior intelligence with hot-headed zeal ; and the large number of those who, though they now took the side of the zealots for the restoration of paganism, had yet received some impression from Christianity, might, under a slight turn of circumstances, be easily led to take another step towards the Christian faith. But to bishop Otto this favourable preparation of the popular mind was wholly

unknown. He was expecting the worst from the tumultuous frenzy of the pagans ; and placing no reliance whatever on human means, or any concurrence of natural causes ; trusting in God alone, and resigned to his will, he went boldly forward to meet the threatening danger, prepared with a cheerful heart to die the death of a martyr. He at first found a place of refuge, for himself and his companions, in a church that stood before the city. As soon as this became known in the town, a band of armed men, led on by priests, collected around this spot, threatening destruction to the church, and death to those that occupied it. Had the bishop given way to fear, or betrayed the least alarm, the furious mob would, perhaps, have proceeded to fulfil their threats ; but the courage and presence of mind displayed by the bishop put a damper on the fury of the threatening mob. Having commended himself and his friends to God in prayer, he walked forth, dressed in his episcopal robes, and surrounded by his clergy, bearing before him the cross and relics, and chanting psalms and hymns. The calmness with which this was done, the awe-inspiring character of the whole proceeding, confounded the multitude. All remained quiet and silent. The more prudent, or the more favourably disposed to Christianity, took advantage of this to put down the excitement. The priests were told that they should defend their cause, not with violence, but with arguments ; and one after another the crowd dispersed. This occurred on Friday, and the Saturday following was spent by Otto in preparing himself, by prayer and fasting, for the approaching crisis.

In the mean time, Witstack, stimulated by the bishop's arrival, went forth among the people, testifying, with more boldness than ever, in favour of Christianity and against paganism. He brought his friends and kinsmen to the bishop ; he exhorted him not to give up the contest, promised him victory, and advised with him as to the steps which should next be taken. On Sunday, after performing mass, Otto suffered himself to be led by Witstack to the market-place. Mounting the steps, from whence the herald and magistrates were accustomed to address the people, after Witstack by signs and words had enjoined silence, Otto began to speak, and the major part listened silently and with attention to what he said, as it was translated by the interpreter, already mentioned, into

the language of the country; but now a tall, well-habited priest, of great bodily strength, pressing forward, drowned the words of both with his shouts, at the same time endeavouring to stir up the anger of the pagans against the enemy of their gods. He called on them to seize upon this opportunity of avenging their deities. Lances were poised; but still no one dared attempt any injury to the bishop. Well might the confident faith and the courage that flowed from it, the perfect composure manifested by the bishop amid this tumultuous scene, the imposing and dignified gravity of his whole demeanour, make a great impression on the multitude, particularly on those who had previously been in any way affected by the influence of Christianity, and had not as yet succeeded in wholly obliterating the impression. Such a fact, in which we must certainly recognize the power of the godlike, might in such a period soon come to be conceived and represented more under the colour of the miraculous, and this representation would contribute again to promote the belief in men's minds of the divine power of Christianity. Otto immediately took advantage of the favourable impression thus produced. Proceeding with the crowd of believers that now surrounded him, to the church by which the pagan altar had recently been erected, he consecrated it anew, and caused the injuries it had received to be repaired at his own expense.

On the next day, the people assembled to decide what course ought to be taken with regard to the matter of religion. They remained together from early in the morning until midnight. Individuals appeared who represented all that had occurred on the day before as miraculous, bearing testimony with enthusiasm to the active, self-sacrificing love of the bishop; foremost among these was that zealous Christian and admirer of Otto, Witstack. A decree was passed accordingly, that Christianity should be introduced, and everything that pertained to idolatry destroyed. Witstack hastened the same night to inform the bishop of all that had transpired. The latter rose early the next morning to render thanks to God, at the celebration of the mass. After this he called a meeting of the citizens, where he spoke to them words of encouragement, which were received in the manner to be expected after such a decree of the popular assembly. Many who had apostatized requested to be received back into the community of the faithful.

The winning kindness of Otto's manners, as well as his readiness to take advantage of the most trifling circumstances which could be turned to account in his labours, is illustrated by the following incident. One day, on his way to church, he saw a troop of boys in the street at play,—kindly saluting them in the language of the country, he retorted their jokes, and having signed the cross over them, and given them his blessing, left them. After he had proceeded along a few steps, looking behind, he observed that the children, attracted by the strange act, followed after him. He stopped; and calling the little ones around him, inquired who of them had been baptized? These he exhorted to remain steadfast to their baptismal vow, and to avoid the society of the unbaptized. They took him at his word, and even in the midst of their play listened attentively to his discourse.\* Still, the zeal of bishop Otto was not always accompanied with befitting prudence; hence he often exposed himself to great peril. While busied in destroying all the pagan temples and monuments of superstition, resolved to let nothing remain which was in anywise adapted so to impress the senses as to promote idolatry, he came across a magnificent nut-tree, whose refreshing shade was enjoyed by many, and which the people of the neighbourhood earnestly besought him to spare. But as it was consecrated to a deity, the bishop was too fearful of the dangerous sensuous impression to yield to their wishes. Most indignant of all was the owner of the estate on which the tree stood. After he had stormed about in a frenzy of passion, his anger seemed at length to have spent itself. Suddenly, however, raising his axe behind the back of the bishop, he would have dealt him a fatal blow, had not the latter, at the same moment, inclined himself a little on the other side. All now fell upon the man, and it was the bishop who rescued him out of their hands. Again, during his passage from Stettin, he was threatened by

\* The unknown biographer introduces this anecdote, l. III. p. 85, before that popular assembly which decided the question with regard to the introduction of Christianity into Pommerania; but it is plain from the connection of his own account, that it occurred some time afterwards. From this account, it appears also to have been by no means the fact, as might be inferred from what he says respecting the effect and consequences of Otto's discourse, held after the above assembly, that all directly submitted to baptism.

an attack of the pagan party, which, as it diminished in numbers, grew more violent in rancour; but he fortunately escaped. Accompanied by his clergy, and a number of the more respectable citizens of Stettin, he proceeded to Julin, where also, after such an example had been set them by the capital, he laboured with good success. Gladly, and without shrinking from a martyr's death, he would have extended his labours also to the island of Rügen, had he not been obliged, in the year 1128, by his engagements as a member of the imperial diet, to return to Germany; so, after paying another visit to the new communities, he shaped his course homeward. But, even amidst the manifold cares of his civil and spiritual relations, he did not lose sight of the Pommeranians. On learning that certain Pommeranian Christians had been conveyed into captivity among pagan hordes, he determined to procure their release. He ordered a large quantity of valuable cloth to be purchased in Halle, and sending the whole to Pommerania, where these goods stood in high demand, appropriated a part as presents to the nobles, with a view to secure their kind feelings toward the infant church; and ordered the remainder to be sold and converted into ransom-money for those captives.

But in pushing forward with so much zeal and resolution the mission among the Pommeranians, Otto neglected one thing, which was of the utmost consequence in order to a settled, enduring foundation of Christian culture among the people; and this was, to make provision for the imparting of Christian instruction in the language of the country. There was a want of German clergy, well skilled in the Slavic language; there was a want of institutions for the purpose of giving the native inhabitants an education suited to the spiritual calling. No doubt, both these, owing to the short time employed in the conversion of the people, were wants the supply of which would be attended with great difficulties; but the consequence of it was, that ecclesiastics had to be called out of Germany, who always remained, in national peculiarities, language, and customs, too foreign from these Wends, and had but little true love for them. What contributed to the same evil was, that German colonists, in ever-increasing numbers, were called in to replenish the territories which had been laid waste, and the cities which had been desolated, by the preceding wars. These foreigners met the Wends with a sort of contempt. A feud



sprung up between the new and the old inhabitants of the land, and the latter were induced to withdraw themselves into the back parts of the country.\* The same injustice was here done to the aborigines by the new race of foreigners who settled down in the land, as has often been done over again in later times and in other quarters of the world.

Christianity had not as yet found admittance into the island of Rügen, but its inhabitants still maintained their freedom, and held fast to their ancient sacred customs. Thus the bond of union was severed between these islanders and the Christian Pommeranians. It was not until after repeated battles, that Waldemar king of Denmark at last succeeded, in the year 1168, to subjugate the island; and then the destruction of paganism and the founding of the Christian church first became practicable. The inspiring soul of this enterprise was bishop Absalom, of Roeskilde, a man who conceived it possible to unite in himself the statesman, the warrior, and the bishop;† and who was therefore the least fitted of all men to bring about the conversion of a people in the proper sense. Through his mediation, a compact was formed with the inhabitants of the capital town Arcona, which compact laid the foundation for the subjection of the entire island. They obliged themselves by this agreement to renounce paganism, and to introduce among them Christianity, according to the usages of the Danish church. The landed estates of the temples were to devolve on the clergy. When the monstrous idol of Svantovit was to be removed from the city, not a single native-born individual dared lay hands on it, so dreaded by all was the vengeance of the deity; but when the idol had been dragged off to the camp of the Danes, without any of the anticipated dreadful consequences, some complained of the wrong done to their god, while others considered the ancient faith as already

\* Thomas Kantzow's *Chronicle of Pommerania*, published by W. Böhrner, p. 35.

† His ardent friend and eulogist, the famous Danish historian Saxo-Grammaticus, Provost of Roeskilde, who, on his recommendation, undertook his work of history, calls him "*militiæ et religionis sociato fulgore conspicuus*;" this historian and ecclesiastic finding nothing offensive in such a combination. War with pagans for the good of the church, seemed to him not a whit foreign to the character of a bishop. "*Neque enim minus sacrorum attinet cultui, publice religionis hostes repellere, quam ceremoniarum tutelæ vacare.*" Lib. XIV., p. 440, ed. Klotz.

overturned by this experiment, and now ridiculed the monster they had before adored. Still more must this impression have been strengthened in their minds, when they saw the idol hewn in pieces, and the fragments of wood used in the camp for cooking provisions. The clergy living in the service of the nobles were sent into the town to instruct and baptize the people according to the notions of that period; but among such a clergy, who at the same time served as secretaries to the nobles, it is hardly to be supposed that much Christian knowledge was to be found. The great temple was burnt, and the foundations laid for a Christian church. The same course was pursued in other parts of the island. The work was prosecuted by priests, whom bishop Absalom sent over from Denmark, after the recall of those ecclesiastics who were only intended to supply the immediate want. He provided the means for their subsistence, so that they might not be felt as a burden on the people. Many incidents occurred here also by which people were led to ascribe the cure of various diseases to the prayers of the priests; but the historian of this period, though he reports them as miracles, does not profess to consider them as proving the holiness of these ecclesiastics, but only as works of divine grace to facilitate the conversion of that people.\*

We noticed, in the preceding period, the founding of a great Christian empire of the Wends by Gottschalk. This empire perished, however, with its founder, when he was assassinated; and paganism had revived again under Cruko, a prince very hostilely disposed towards Christianity. Yet Gottschalk's son, Henry, who had taken refuge in Denmark, succeeded, with the help of Christian princes, in putting down the opposition of the pagan Wends, and by his means, in 1105, the Wendish kingdom was restored. He endeavoured also to re-establish Christianity; but when he died, in the year 1126, his two sons, Canute and Zwentipolk, fell into a quarrel with each other, which could not fail to operate disastrously on the interests of the Wendish people, both in a political and in an ecclesiastical point of view. With these two sons, the family of Gottschalk became extinct; and the people, who along with their liberties defended also their ancient sacred customs, saw

\* Saxo: "Quod potius lucranda gentis respectui, quam sacerdotum sanctitati divinitus concessum videri potest."

themselves abandoned without mercy to the power of the Christian princes of Germany. It was not till after the margrave Albert the Bear, and duke Henry the Lion, had wholly subdued the Wends, that the Christian church could establish itself in this part of Germany on a solid foundation, and that the bishoprics previously founded could be restored. But the war-wasted districts were peopled by foreign Christian colonists from other quarters of Germany; and what the spirit of Christianity required, namely, that the national individuality should be preserved inviolate, and, ennobled by true religion, should be unfolded to a higher order of perfection, was left unaccomplished. It would be remote from the present design to give an account of wars, which could be of no real service in extending the kingdom of Christ among these tribes.

We pass on to mention *one* individual, who, in the midst of disorder and destruction, endeavoured, with self-denying love, to labour for the saving good of the nations. This was *Vicelin*. Sprung from a family of the middle class at Quernheim, a village on the banks of the Weser, and early deprived of his parents, he found pity with a woman of noble birth, who took him to her castle, Everstein, where she suffered him to want for nothing. A question put to him by the envious priest of the village, with a view to embarrass and shame him, brought him to the consciousness and confession of his ignorance; but this incident, which he himself regarded as a gracious act of Divine Providence,\* turned out to him a salutary incentive, and gave a new direction to his life. Filled with shame, he immediately left the castle, and betaking himself to the then flourishing school at Paderborn, applied himself to study with so much diligence and application, that Hartmann, the master of that school, had little else to do than to check and moderate his zeal. In a short time, he made such progress in the acquisition of knowledge that his master made him an assistant in the school. Somewhat later, he was called himself to take the superintendence of a school in Bremen. After presiding over this institution for a few years with great zeal, his earnest longing after a more complete education impelled him to visit that far-famed seat of science, then filled with lovers of learning

\* Helmold, vide vol. iv. p. 105, whose report we here follow, says of him, i. 142: "Audivi eum sæpenumero dicentem, quia ad verbum illius sacerdotis respexerit eum misericordia divina."

from all parts of Europe, the Parisian University. Here, it was not the predominant dialectic tendency, for which the University of Paris was especially famous, but the simple biblical tendency, by which he felt himself to be most strongly attracted. After having spent three years at this University (A. D. 1125), he thought he might venture on a step from which distrust in his youth, still exposed to temptations, had hitherto deterred him, and to receive the priestly consecration. Presently, he was seized also with a desire to convey the blessing of the gospel to those parts where it was most greatly needed. The report of what the Wendish king Henry was doing for the establishment of the Christian church among his people, drew him to that quarter. Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen gave him a commission to preach the gospel to the Slavonians. Two other ecclesiastics, Rudolph, a priest from Hildesheim, and Ludolf, a canonical from Verden, joined him as fellow-labourers in the sacred enterprise. King Henry, to whom they offered their services, received them readily, showing them great respect, and assigning to them a church in Lubec, where he himself usually resided, as the seat of their labours. Before they could commence them, however, the king died; and the ensuing wars between his sons rendered it impossible for them to effect anything in that district. Vicelin now returned back to archbishop Adalbert of Bremen, whom he attended on his tour of visitation in a diocese, the borders of which were inhabited by Slavic tribes. It so happened that, in the year 1126, when Vicelin was accompanying the archbishop on such a tour of visitation, the inhabitants of the border-town Faldera,\* applied to the latter for a priest to reside amongst them. A convenient centre was here presented to Vicelin for his labours among the Slavonians, and he gladly accepted the call. He found here a poor, uncultivated country, rendered desolate by many wars, numbers who were Christians only in name, manifold remains of idolatry, groves and fountains consecrated to the deities. He preached with energy and effect; the truths, which were as yet wholly new to the rude multitude, found ready entrance into their minds. He destroyed the remaining objects of idolatrous worship, travelled about in the

\* As it was named by the Wends; otherwise, Wippendorf; at a later period, Neumünster.

northern districts of the Elbe, and made it the aim of his preaching not to convert the people into nominal Christians merely, but to lead them to repentance and to a genuine Christian temper of mind. His pious, indefatigable activity stimulated others to imitate his example. A free society was instituted of unmarried laymen and ecclesiastics, who, under his guidance, entered into a mutual agreement to devote themselves to a life of prayer, charity, and self-mortification; to visit the sick, to relieve the necessities of the poor, to labour for their own salvation and that of others, and especially to pray and labour for the conversion of the Slavonians. A spiritual society of this sort being one of the wants of the time, belonging to that peculiar spirit of fraternization with which the awakening religious life readily united itself, gave birth to many others, like those religious associations called the apostolical. When the emperor Lothaire the Second, in the year 1134, visited the province of Holstein, Vicelin found that he took a warm interest in his plan for the establishment of the Christian church among the Slavonians. By Vicelin's advice, the emperor built a fortress at Segeberg, to protect the country against the Slavonians; a proceeding which, it must be allowed, was hardly calculated to make a favourable impression on that people; for the Slaves looked upon it as a new mode of infringing upon their liberties. Here it was now proposed to erect a new church, which was to be committed to the care of Vicelin. To him, the emperor intrusted also the care of the church in Lubec; and consequently, the entire direction of the mission among the Slavonians was placed in his hands. At Segeberg and Lubec he could now proceed to establish a seminary for missionaries among that people; but by the political quarrels and disturbances, which followed the death of Lothaire, in 1137, his labours here were again interrupted. Those districts once more fell a prey to the fury of the Slavonians; the Christian foundations were destroyed, the clergy obliged to flee, and the labours of Vicelin were again confined to Faldera alone. But even this spot was not long spared from the ravages of the Slavonians. Vicelin took occasion, from these calamities, to direct the attention of men from perishable things to eternal, teaching them to find in the gospel the true source of trust and consolation in God. After having passed several years under these distressing circum-

stances, his outward situation was again changed for the better by the establishment of the authority of duke Adolph of Holstein in these districts, after the subjugation of the Slaves. This new sovereign carried out the plans already contemplated by the emperor Lothaire, in favour of Vicelin, not only restoring the church at Segeberg, but also giving back the landed estates which had been presented to it by the emperor. But to avoid the bustle and confusion of the fortress, Vicelin removed the monastery to the neighbouring city of Högelsdorf, a place more favourably situated to secure the quiet necessary for the spiritual life. When, at a later period, the war broke out afresh with the Slavonians, and in consequence of it a famine arose in those districts, Vicelin, by his exhortations and example, stirred up the spirit of benevolence. Large bodies of poor people daily presented themselves before the gates of the monastery at Högelsdorf. Presiding over the monastery was a scholar of Vicelin's, the priest Dittmar, a man of similar spirit, who had relinquished a canonicate at Bremen for the purpose of joining the pious society. Dittmar exhausted all his resources in endeavouring to alleviate the prevailing distress. Meanwhile, these Slavic tribes were completely subdued by duke Henry the Lion; and archbishop Hartwig of Bremen, having it now in his power to restore the ruined bishoprics, consecrated Vicelin, in the year 1148, as bishop of Oldenburg. But the man who, during this long series of years, had freely laboured, according to his own principles, serving only the pure interests of Christianity, instead of finding himself now, in his old age, enabled to act more independently in this higher dignity, saw himself cramped and confined in various ways by a foreign spirit, and by other interests.\* As the duke had already been vexed because the archbishop had renewed those bishoprics without his advice and concurrence, and nominated Vicelin bishop of a city in his own territory, so he thought he might at least demand that the latter should receive from him the investiture. Vicelin, who, by virtue of the genuine Christian spirit which actuated him, rose superior to the interests of the hierarchy and of the episcopal prerogative, would gladly have yielded the point at once, in order to preserve a

\* His friend Helmold says: "*Videres virum antea magni nominis, possessorem libertatis et compotem suimet post acceptum episcopale nomen, quasi innodatum vinculis quibusdam et supplicem omnium.*"

good understanding with the duke, and to avoid being disturbed in his spiritual labours; but the archbishop of Bremen and his clergy positively forbade it, since they looked upon it as a pitiable disgrace to the church that the bishop should receive the investiture from any other hands than those of the emperor.\* He was now exposed, therefore, to suffer many vexations and embarrassments from the duke. He could not get hold of the revenues which belonged to him. Meanwhile, he did what he could, and in particular took great pains to perform the tours of visitation in his diocese. He laboured earnestly in preaching the gospel to the Slavonians, yet he met with but little success among them. Finding himself so much embarrassed in the discharge of his official duties by his misunderstanding with the duke, he finally resolved to sacrifice the respect due to his ecclesiastical superiors to the higher interest of the welfare of souls. Therefore, he said to the duke, "For the sake of him who humbled himself on our account, I am ready to do homage to each one of your vassals, to say nothing of yourself, a prince exalted to so high a station by the Lord." By this concession, he involved himself in unpleasant relations with his archbishop. At last, he had the misfortune to lose the faithful friend who laboured on in the same spirit as himself, the priest Dittmar. During the last two years and a half of his life, he saw himself completely shut out from all official labours; for he was so severely affected by repeated shocks of apoplexy, that he could neither move nor even control his organs of speech. All that remained in his power was to exert himself for the edification of others by the tranquillity and patience which he manifested under the severest sufferings. Like the apostle John, and Gregory of Utrecht, he had to be borne to the church on the shoulders of his disciples. He died on the 13th of December, 1154.

The Christian church was again planted during this period among the Slavic populations in the countries on the coasts of the Baltic sea. This work we will now contemplate more in detail. The attempts made by the Danish kings to convert men by force, had, in this region also, only served to diffuse

\* Helmold says of these clergymen: "Nam et ipsi vaniglorii et divitiis adultæ ecclesiæ saturi, honori suo hoc in facto derogari putabant, nec magnopere fructum, sed numerum suffraganeorum sedium curabant."

more widely the hatred against Christianity and the Christians. It was by means of commerce that more peaceful relations came finally to be established between the *Lieflanders* and Christian nations. This was an important preparation for the work of missions, by which more could be effected for the introduction of Christianity, and the well-being of the nations, than by any of the attempts to combine the chivalric spirit with Christian zeal. In the year 1158, merchants of Bremen began to form commercial connections with the Lieflanders and the bordering tribes. Their ships often visited the Düna, where they established settlements for trade. The priest Meinhard, from the already-mentioned monastery of Segeberg in Holstein, a venerable old man, was moved by a pious zeal, even in his old age, to embark in one of the enterprises of these merchants, with a view to convey the message of salvation to the pagan people. In the year 1186, he arrived on the spot. He got permission from the Russian prince Wladimir, of Plozk, to preach the gospel to the Lieflanders; and at Yxküll, beyond Riga, where the merchants had already built a fortress for the security of trade, he founded the first church. A number of the first men of the nation consented to receive baptism from him. On a certain occasion, when the Lieflanders were attacked by pagan tribes from Lithuania, Meinhard directed the measures for defence, and under his guidance the invaders were repelled. By this transaction, he won their confidence still more. He taught them, moreover, how to guard against such attacks for the future, instructing them in the art of fortification, of which they were entirely ignorant. On their promising to submit to baptism, he sent to Gothland for workmen and building materials, and erected two fortresses, at Yxküll and Holm, for the protection of the people; but more than once he was compelled by bitter experience to find that those who had suffered themselves to be baptized only to obtain his assistance in their bodily necessities, when they had secured their object, relapsed into paganism, and sought to wash away their baptism in the waters of the Düna. Meinhard, in the meanwhile, was on a journey to Bremen, where he went to make a report of the success he had met with to his archbishop and to the pope. Archbishop Hartwig of Bremen, ordained him bishop over the new church; but very much still needed to be done before he could discharge the functions of



the episcopal office. After his return, he found how grossly he had been deceived by those Lieflanders who had needed his assistance in temporal things.

To aid in sustaining this work, Theodoric, a Cistercian monk, had come upon the ground, and settled down at Threida (Thoreida); but the pagans took a dislike to him, for the superior condition of his fields had aroused their jealousy. Already they thought of sacrificing him to their deities. Whilst they were deliberating on the matter, he called upon God in prayer. The omen which, according to Slavic custom, they took from the steppings of a horse which they kept for divination,\* turned out favourably for him, and his life was spared. At another time he was brought into great peril by an eclipse of the sun, the people attributing this terror-spreading phenomenon to his magical arts. The rude pagans were easy to believe that one so superior to themselves in knowledge and culture was able to do anything, so a wounded man once applied to him to be healed, promising that, if he obtained relief, he would be baptized. Theodoric had no knowledge of medicine, but trusting in God, whose assistance he invoked, he composed a mixture of crushed herbs, and, as the remedy was followed by a cure, the patient, one of the principal men of the nation, submitted to baptism. This example had its effect upon others; but it was with manifold vexations, anxieties, and dangers that Meinhard had to struggle to the last. Sometimes the Lieflanders, when they had an object to gain by it, or when they felt afraid that an armed force might be coming to his assistance, were ready to promise anything; and when he was on the point of leaving them, strove to retain him in their country—at other times they only mocked him. Already he had applied to the pope to assist him in this enterprise, and the latter had promised to do so, when, in the year 1196, he died alone at Yxküll, but not till he had obtained a promise from the Lieflanders that they would consent to receive another bishop. Berthold, abbot of the Cistercian monastery at Lockum, was appointed his successor, and consecrated as a bishop over the new church. It was his intention, at first, not to resort to the sword, but to gain over the minds of the Lieflanders by the power of the

\* See ante, p. 20.

truth and of love ; he only failed to persevere in this good resolution. He came to Liefland without an armed force, called together, near the church at Yxküll, the better disposed amongst the Christians and pagans, supplied them bountifully with food and drink, distributed presents among them, and then said that, called by themselves, he came there to supply the place of their departed bishop. At first they received him in a friendly manner, but soon he had to hear of plots among the pagans, who were resolved to put him to death. The consequence of this was, an armed crusade, at the head of which the new bishop returned back to Liefland. He himself, it is true, fell in battle, but the army was victorious. The Lieflanders sued for peace : they declared themselves willing to receive clergymen, and a hundred and fifty of the people already consented to receive baptism. The army of crusaders was thus induced to leave the country ; but nothing better was to be expected than that the Lieflanders, when no longer restrained by fear, would soon return to their old practices. Scarcely had the army of the Germans left their shores than they again renounced Christianity : two hundred Christians were put to death, the clergy barely made out to save themselves by flight, and the Christian merchants themselves could only purchase security for their lives by presents to the principal men. The canonical priest, Albert von Apeldern of Bremen, was appointed bishop of the new church, and a fresh army accompanied him, in the year 1199, to Liefland. After the successful termination of the new campaign, in order to fix a stable seat for the Christian church on a spot more secure and better situated for intercourse with the Christian world, the town of Riga was built, in the year 1200, and the bishopric of Yxküll translated to this place ; but it was necessary that an armed force should be kept always at hand here, not only to maintain possession of the place, and to secure the Christian foundations, in a constant struggle with the pagan inhabitants of the country, but also to ward off the destructive inroads of other pagan tribes in the neighbourhood, and to resist the Russian princes on the border, who were impatient of any foreign dominion in these parts. To this end, a standing order of spiritual knights, formed in accordance with the spirit of these times, by a union of knighthood with the clerical vocation, the *ordo fratrum militiæ Christi*, was instituted, which

chose the Virgin Mary, to whom the new bishopric had been dedicated, as its patroness.

Not till after a war of twenty years was tranquillity secured. From this point the church was planted in Esthland and Semgallen; and at length Curland also, in the year 1230, submitted to her sway, not compelled by outward force, but yet driven by fear.

It would be foreign from our purpose to enter farther into the history of these warlike enterprises. We will simply notice in these movements, so alien from Christianity, such particulars as present to our observation the least trace of the Christian spirit. In the midst of these wars men did not entirely neglect to employ the method of persuasion, and to diffuse Christian knowledge, though they did not adopt the most suitable means for this purpose. Among these means belonged the spiritual plays which came into vogue in this period, and were designed to represent historical scenes from the Old and New Testaments. Thus, during an interim of peace, in the year 1204, the opportunity was taken advantage of to exhibit, in the recently built city of Riga, a prophetic play, designed to combine entertainment and instruction for the new Christians and the pagans, and to fix, by sensuous impressions, the sacred stories and doctrines more deeply on their minds.\* By means of interpreters the subjects of these dramatical representations were more clearly explained to them. When Gideon's troop attacked the Philistines, great terror fell on the pagan spectators, as they supposed it applied to themselves. They betook themselves to flight, and it was only after much persuasion that their confidence could be restored.† When again, after a bloody war and deliverance from great dangers, a time of peace once more returned, archbishop Andreas of

\* Thus a man who was in part an eye-witness of these events, the priest Heinrich der Lette, in the *Chronicon Livonicum*, f. 34, published by Gruber, says: "*Ut fidei Christianæ rudimenta gentilitas fide etiam discret oculata.*"

† The Priest Heinrich expresses more truth than he seems himself to be conscious of, when he considers this dramatical exhibition as a fore-token of the calamities of the following years: "*In eodem ludo erant bella, utpote David, Gideonis, Herodis. Erat et doctrina veteris et novi testamenti, quia nimirum per bella plurima, quæ sequuntur, convertenda erat gentilitas, et per doctrinam veteris et novi testamenti erat instruenda, qualiter ad verum pacificum et ad vitam perveniat sempiternam.*"

Lund, who came in company with the allied Danes, assembled, in the winter of 1205, all the clergy in Riga, and during the whole season gave them theological discourses on the Psalter.\* Many amongst the clergy, for which order men were fond of selecting monks, devoted themselves in good earnest to the work of promoting the salvation of the Lieflanders. One of these was monk Sigfrid, who presided as priest and pastor over the church at Holm, and by his life of piety and devotion left a deep impression on the minds of the people. At his death, in the year 1202, the new converts zealously went to work and made him a beautiful coffin, in which they bore him, weeping, to the place of burial.†

Over the church connected with the recently built fortress, Friedland, was placed a priest of the Cistercian order, Frederic of Celle. On Palm-Sunday of the year 1213 he had celebrated mass with great devotion, and then preached with much fervour on the passion of Christ, closing his discourse with touching words of exhortation addressed to the new Christians. After having here celebrated also the Easter festival, he was intending to cross over with his assistants and a few of his new Christians to Riga; but on the passage they were surprised by a vessel fully manned with ferocious pagans from the island of Correzar (Ozilia), a haunt of pirates, which had offered the stoutest and longest resistance to the introduction of Christianity. Under the cruel tortures with which the exasperated pagans sought to put him to a lingering death, he lifted his eyes to heaven, and with his disciples thanked God that he had counted him worthy of martyrdom.‡ In the year 1206, the Letti made a desolating irruption into Liefland, and a village near Threida was suddenly attacked by them, whilst the community were assembled in the church. When this became known, the Lieflanders, in great consternation, rushed from the church. Some succeeded in finding places of concealment in the neighbouring forest, others, who hurried to their dwellings, were taken captive on the way, and some of them put to death; but the priest, John Strick, supported by another priest and by his servants, would not be disturbed in his devotions at the celebration of the mass, but, conse-

\* The words of the above mentioned priest: "*Et legendo in Psalterio totam hiemem in divina contemplatione deducuntur.*" L. c. f. 43.

† L. c. f. 26.

‡ L. c. f. 97.

crating himself to God as an offering, committed his life into the hands of his Master, resigned to suffer whatever he should appoint; and after they had finished the mass, placing the several articles which belonged to the celebration of the office in a heap together at one corner of the sacristy, they concealed themselves in the same spot. Three several times the troops of the Letti broke into the sanctuary, but seeing the altar stripped of its furniture, they gave up the hope of finding the plunder they were in search of, that which was concealed escaping their notice. When all had gone off, the priests thanked God for their deliverance: in the evening they forsook the church and fled into the forest, where, for three days, they subsisted on the bread they took with them. On the fourth day they arrived at Riga.\*

In a fight between the converted Letti and the pagans of Esthland, which took place in the year 1207, a Lettian priest mounted a redoubt, and sang a sacred hymn to the praise of God, accompanying his voice with an instrument. The rude pagans, on hearing the soft melody of the song and its accompaniment, a thing altogether new to them, for a time left off fighting, and demanded what the occasion was for such expressions of joy. "We rejoice," said the Letti, "and we praise God, because but a short time ago we received baptism, and now see that God defends us."†

Amongst these people the influence of Christianity was manifest again in the fact, that it brought them to a conscious sense of the equal dignity of all men, doing away amongst them the arbitrary and false distinction of higher and lower races. The Letti had, in fact, been hitherto regarded and treated as an inferior race of men, but through Christianity they attained to the consciousness of possessing equal worth and equal rights with all; the priests, therefore, to whom they were indebted for so great an improvement in their condition, were received by them with joy.‡ The only law that had hitherto been in force amongst the Lieflanders was club-law.

\* L. c. f. 49.

† L. c. f. 57.

‡ The words of the priest Heinrich: "Erant enim Letthi ante fidem susceptam humiles et despecti, et multas injurias sustinentes a Livonibus et Estonibus, unde ipsi magis gaudebant de adventu sacerdotum, eo quod post baptismum eodem jure et eadem pace omnes gauderunt." L. c. f. 56.

By means of Christianity they were first made conscious of the need of a settled system of justice. The inhabitants of Threida made a petition to their priest Hildebrand, that the civil as well as the ecclesiastical law might be introduced amongst them, and that their disputes might be settled by it.\*

At the close of the war, in 1224, pope Honorius the Third, in compliance with the request of the bishop of Riga, sent William, bishop of Modena, the papal chancellor, as a legate to Liefland. This prelate spared no pains in dispensing amongst the ancient inhabitants of the country and their conquerors such exhortations as their respective circumstances required. The Germans he exhorted to mildness in their behaviour to the new converts, charging them to lay on their shoulders no intolerable burdens, but only the light and easy yoke, and to instruct them constantly in the sacred truths.† He cautioned those who bore the sword against being too hard on the Esthlanders in the collection of tithes and imposts, lest they should be driven to relapse into idolatry.‡ These exhortations to a mild, indulgent treatment of the natives he repeated, on various occasions, amongst the different classes.

With the establishment of the Christian church in these lands was closely connected its establishment also amongst another Slavic people, the Prussians; for that same order of spiritual knights which had been founded for the purpose of giving stability to the Christian foundations in Liefland, formed a union with another order for the accomplishment of this work. We must now revert to many things strictly belonging to the preceding period, but which, for the sake of preserving the connection of events, we reserved to the present occasion.

Adalbert of Prague, the archbishop who had to endure so many hard conflicts with the rudeness of his people, betook

\* L. c. f. 46. The priest Heinrich says that the Lieflanders were at first very well satisfied with their judges, or so-called advocates; namely, so long as pious men, who were governed only by Christian motives, administered this office. But it turned out otherwise when laymen, who sought only how they might enrich themselves, obtained these posts.

† "Ne Teutonici gravaminis aliquod jugum importabile neophytorum humeris imponerent, sed jugum Domini leve ac suave, fideique semper docerent sacramenta."

‡ L. c. f. 173.

himself, after he had abandoned his bishopric for the third time, to Boleslav the first, duke of Poland, expecting to find amongst the pagans in this quarter a field of activity suited to the glowing ardour of his zeal. He finally determined to go amongst the Prussians. The duke gave him a vessel, and thirty soldiers to protect him. Thus attended, he sailed to Dantzic,\* as this was the frontier-place between Prussia and Poland. Here he first made his appearance as a preacher of the gospel, and he succeeded in baptizing numbers. Then, sailing from this place and landing on the opposite coast, he sent back the ship and her crew. He desired to commit himself, as a messenger of peace, wholly to God's protection. He did not choose to appear standing under the protection of any human power, but would avoid everything which might awaken suspicion amongst the pagans. The only persons he kept with him were the priest Benedict and his own pupil Gaudentius. It was an open beach where they were set down, and, taking a small boat, they rowed to an island formed at the mouth of the river Pregel;† but the owners of the lands approached with cudgels to drive them away, and one dealt him so severe a blow with an oar, that the psalter, from which he was singing, dropped from his hand, and he fell to the ground. As soon as he had recovered himself he said, "I thank thee, Lord, for the privilege thou hast bestowed on me of suffering even a blow for my crucified saviour." On Saturday they rowed to the other shore of the Pregel, on the coast of Samland. The lord of the domain, whom they happened to meet, conducted them to his village. A large body of people collected together. When Adalbert had given an account of himself, of the country he came from, and of his errand, the people told him they wanted to hear nothing about a foreign law, and threatened them all with death unless they sailed off the same night. Compelled to leave these coasts, they turned back again, tarrying five days in a village where they brought

\* Gedania.

† As may be gathered from the words of the ancient account of his life, Mens. April. T. III. c. vi. fol. 186: "*Intrant parvam insulam, quæ curvo amne circumjecta formam circuli adeuntibus monstrat.*" See Voigt's remarks, respecting these specified marks in relation to the geographical situation of places, in his *Geschichte von Preussen*, Bd. I. s. 267.

up. Here, on the night of Thursday, the brother Gaudentius had a dream, which next morning he related to the bishop. He saw standing on the middle of the altar a golden chalice half filled with wine. He asked permission to drink from it, but the servant of the altar forbade him. Neither he nor any other person could be allowed to drink from it, said he. It was reserved against the morrow, for the bishop, to give him spiritual strength. "May the Lord's blessing," said Adalbert, on hearing this, "bring to pass what this vision promises; but we should place no confidence in a deceitful dream." At the break of day, they proceeded on their journey, cheerily making their way through the pathless woods, shortening the distance with spiritual songs. About noon they came to some open fields. Here Gaudentius celebrated the mass: Adalbert received the cup, then took some refreshment, and after they had proceeded a few steps farther, the three seated themselves upon the grass. Wearied with travel, they all fell into a profound sleep, which lasted till they were awakened by the noise of a tumultuous band of pagans, who seized and bound them in chains. Said Adalbert to his companions, "Be not troubled, my brethren; we know, indeed, for whose name we suffer. What is there more glorious than to give up life for our precious Jesus?" Upon this, Siggo, a priest, plunged a lance through his body; the others then vented their rage upon him. Adalbert, streaming with blood, kept his head erect and his eyes fixed on heaven. This happened on the 23rd of April, 997.\*

The second person who attempted to convert the Prussians was Bruno, surnamed Bonifacius.† He was descended from a family of note in Querfurt, and became court-chaplain of the emperor Otto the Third, who valued him highly on account of his spiritual attainments. This monarch took him along with

\* We certainly cannot doubt that the circumstantial and simple narrative came from the mouth of one of Adalbert's companions, who probably were redeemed from their captivity among the Prussians by Duke Boleslav; for the author of the second account of Adalbert's life states, that the Prussians preserved his body with a view of afterwards disposing of it for a large ransom to Duke Boleslav.

† This surname was the occasion of a mistake, two different persons having been made out of these two names, and a missionary Boniface was invented, who is to be wholly stricken out of the list of historical per-



him in a journey to Rome, where perhaps it was the sight of a picture of Boniface, the apostle to the Germans, which led him to resolve on withdrawing from court, becoming a monk, and conveying the message of salvation to the heathen nations. Carrying this resolution into effect, he became a monk of the order of St. Benedict. He procured from Sylvester the Second full powers to engage in a mission to the heathen. This pope conferred on him, for the same end, episcopal ordination, and the pall of an archbishop. With eighteen companions he repaired, in 1007, to Prussia; but all perished by martyrdom on the 14th of February, 1008.

From this time two centuries elapsed, during which, so far as we know, nothing farther was done for the conversion of the Prussians. It was not until 1207 that any new attempt was made for this purpose; at that time, Gottfried, a Polish abbot, from the monastery of Lukina, sailed down the Weichsel, in company with Philip, a monk, and they succeeded in gaining the confidence of the heads of the people. Two of these, Phalet and his brother Sodrach, embraced Christianity and received baptism. At this point the work was interrupted, indeed, by the assassination of monk Philip; but some years later another man appeared, who was far better calculated for such an enterprise, and who began his work with more promising results. *Christian*, a native of Freienwalde, in Pommerania, went forth at that time from the monastery of Oliva, near Dantzic, where, perhaps, the reports he heard concerning the Prussians, and the first attempts which were made to convert them, had served to call forth in him the desire of conveying to them the message of salvation. With several other monks, among whom one in particular is mentioned, named Philip, he repaired, after having first obtained ample authority for this work from pope Innocent the Third,\* to the adjacent province of Prussia. The

\* As pope Innocent the Third, in his letter to the archbishop Gnesen, epp. l. XIII. ep. 128, says, expressly, concerning Christian and his companions: "Ad partes Prussiæ de nostra licentia accesserunt;" and in the letter to the Cistercian abbots, l. XV. ep. 147: "*Olim* de nostra licentia incepterunt seminare in partibus Prussiæ verbum Dei," it is impossible to doubt that the monks, at the very beginning, either orally or by letter, reported their project to the pope, and received from him ample powers for such an enterprise. From this particular point of time it was also the first in which resort was had in such an enterprise to the head of the church.

Happy results of his labours in Prussia induced him, perhaps in accordance with some agreement between him and the pope, in the years 1209 and 1210, to make a journey to Rome. Innocent the Third espoused this cause with that active zeal and prudent forethought, embracing the interests of the whole church, for which he was distinguished. He committed to the archbishop of Gnesen the pastoral care over this mission and the new converts, till their number should be such as to require the labours of a special bishop of their own. In his letter, addressed to this archbishop,\* he says, "Through the grace of him who calls into being that which is not, and who out of stones raises up sons to Abraham, a few of the nobles and some others in that region have received baptism; and would that they might daily make progress in the knowledge of the true faith!" Christian and his companions returned and prosecuted their labours with good success; but from one quarter, where they had every reason to expect countenance and support, they experienced hindrances of all sorts in the prosecution of their work. The Cistercian abbots grew jealous of the independent activity of these men; they put them in the same class with those vagabond monks, who had broken loose from all discipline and order; they refused to acknowledge them as brethren of their order; and denied them those kindly offices which in all other cases the members of the order were wont to show to each other. Therefore the pope issued in behalf of this mission, in the year 1213, a letter addressed to the abbots of the Cistercian chapter.† With the cautious wisdom manifested by this pope on other occasions, he intended, on the one hand, to restrain those monks who merely wished to throw off the forms of legitimate dependence, from roving about, uncalled, as missionaries; and, on the other, to provide that the preaching of the gospel should not be hindered under the pretext of checking such disorders. To secure these ends, the whole matter was placed under the general oversight of the archbishop of Gnesen. He was to apply the right rules for the trying of the spirits, and to furnish those whom he found qualified to preach and influenced by the spirit of love, with testimonials of good standing and letters of recommendation. The pope commanded the Cistercian abbots to forbear from

\* L. c. l. XIII. ep. 128.

† L. c. l. XV. ep. 147.

hindering in their work such persons as were thus accredited. Furthermore, the pope had heard complaints that the dukes of Pommerania and of Poland turned the introduction of Christianity into a means of oppressing the Prussians; that they laid on the Christians heavier burdens than they had previously borne; which, as had often been shown in the case of the Slavic tribes, might end in making Christianity hateful to the people, whose burdens it only served to increase, and to bring about the ruin of the whole mission.\* He therefore sent to these princes a letter, couched in firm and decided language, setting before them the unchristian character of such proceedings. "Although, in the words of the apostle, without faith it is impossible to please God, still, faith alone is not sufficient for this purpose; but love is, in an especial manner, also necessary. As the apostle says: though one may have faith so as to be able to remove mountains, and though one may speak with the tongues of angels and of men, and though one give his whole substance to feed the poor, and have not charity, it profiteth him nothing. Now if, according to the law of Christ, this love is to be extended even to our enemies, how much more is it incumbent on all to practise it towards the newly converted, inasmuch as they, if hardly dealt with, may easily be led into apostasy." "We therefore beseech and exhort you," continues the pope, "for the sake of him who came to save the lost, and to give his life a ransom for many, do not oppress the sons of this new plantation, but treat them with the more gentleness, as they are liable to be misled, and to relapse into paganism; since the old bottles can scarcely hold the new wine." We find from this letter, that Innocent had empowered the archbishop of Gnesen to pronounce the bann on the oppressors of the new converts in Prussia, if they would not listen to reason.

So the monk Christian succeeded in overcoming these difficulties, and his work for the first time went prosperously onward. Two princes whom he had converted made over to him their territory, as a possession for the new church. He

\* "Quidam vestrum," says the pope, in his letter to them, l. XV. ep. 148, "minime attendentes, et quærentes, quæ sua sunt, non quæ Christi, quam cito intelligunt aliquos e gentilibus per Prussiam constitutis novæ regenerationis gratiam suscepisse, statim oneribus eos servilibus aggravant et venientes ad Christianæ fidei libertatem deterioris conditionis efficiunt quam essent, dum sub iugo servitutis pristinae permanserint."

travelled with them to Rome; they were there baptized, and Christian was now consecrated to the office of bishop. But after his return, a stormy insurrection arose on the part of his pagan people, provoked perhaps, in part, by the conduct of the above-mentioned Christian princes. Then similar enterprises followed to those which had taken place in Liefland. The order of German knights, founded during the crusades in the twelfth century, joined themselves for the purpose of engaging in them with the order of the Brethren of the Sword; and it was not till after a long series of years, in the year 1283, that the work was completed; four bishoprics having been previously, in the year 1243, founded for the Prussians;—Kulm, Pomesanien, Ermeland, and Sameland.

Nearly after the same manner was the church planted amongst the Finns. King Eric, of Sweden, whose zeal for the church caused him to be venerated as a saint, undertook for this purpose—inasmuch as the Finns could not be induced to submit in a peaceable manner—a crusade, in which he was accompanied by bishop Heinrich, of Upsala. A characteristic trait, indicating the point of religious development at which he stood, and the strong inclination of his times to cling to external things, is related of him. Kneeling down to thank God, after having won a battle, he was observed to be profusely weeping: and being asked the reason, confessed that it was for pity and commiseration at the fate of so many who had fallen in the fight without being baptized, and were consequently lost, when they might have been saved by the holy sacrament.\*

Let us now throw a glance at the spread of Christianity in *Asia*. It lay in the power of the *Nestorians* to do the most for this object, for their communities were widely scattered over eastern Asia; they were more favoured by the Mohammedan princes than any of the other Christian sects;† and were the most familiarly acquainted with the languages and customs of the Asiatic nations. Till within the ninth century, the Nestorian church† still maintained flourishing schools for the education of their clergy; but after that time these schools seem to have declined. What we learn concerning the Nes-

\* See the *vita s. Eriici*. *Mens. Maj.* d. 18, c. i.

† See, on this point, the extracts from oriental sources in *Assemani Bibliotheca orientalis*, T. III. f. 95. etc.

torian ecclesiastics who roved about Asia, proves that they were often greatly wanting in theological culture, Christian knowledge, and sedateness of Christian character. It is true, they were animated by a zeal for making proselytes; but they were also too often satisfied if people did but profess Christianity outwardly, and observe a certain set of Christian or ecclesiastical usages. We should be the more cautious, therefore, in receiving those reports which Nestorians, inclined to speak extravagantly concerning the merits of their sect, and habituated to the language of Oriental exaggeration, have made respecting their labours for the conversion of pagan tribes. They spread themselves over those districts of Asia in which a certain inclination to the mixing together of different religions always existed. A way was easily found of introducing many things from Christianity into this medley, and the Nestorians might represent this as conversion to Christianity.

Thus, for example, we find, some time after the twelfth century, a legend current in the Western church, respecting a powerful Christian empire in Asia, whose Christian kings, it was said, were at the same time priests, and bore the name of John. By the concurrent testimony of all the accounts from Oriental sources\* and Western travellers of the thirteenth century, it is evident, beyond a doubt, that the kingdom of Keraït in Tartary, lying north of Sina (China), whose residential capital was the city of Caracorum, was here meant. It may be more doubtful what opinion should be formed respecting the Christianity of this people and of its princes, respecting the union of the sacerdotal and kingly offices in the persons of the latter, and respecting the name of John.

The Nestorian metropolitan Ebedjesu, bishop of Maru in Chorasán, in Persia, relates, in a letter to his patriarch Maris,† that a king of Keraït, in the beginning of the eleventh century, had been converted to Christianity by means of Christian merchants, certainly Nestorians.‡ The prince, it is said,

\* See extracts in Assemani, l. c. f. 486. Ssanang Ssetsen's *Geschichte der Ostmongolen*, translated from the Mongol language by Schmidt, p. 87. Petersburg, 1829.

† See Assemani's *Bibliothek*, l. c. p. 484.

‡ This is ascribed to the apparition of a saint, who pointed out the right path to the prince, when he had lost his way in a chase; whether

thereupon sent a request to the metropolitan, that he would either come to him personally, or else send a priest to baptize him. The patriarch, to whom Ebedjesu reported this, is said to have empowered him to send to that country two priests, together with deacons and ecclesiastical vessels. Two hundred thousand people of this nation are said to have embraced Christianity; the priest above mentioned, and his descendants, were known henceforth in the East by the name of the priest-kings, John (Prester John). Various exaggerated stories concerning the power of these princes, and the extent of their empire, were spread abroad by monks in the West. Envoys from them appeared in Rome, sent for the purpose of establishing connections between these pretended great monarchs and the West, through the mediation of the pope. Not only have we every reason to doubt the truth of these reports, but it is also quite questionable whether the persons who represented themselves as envoys, were really authorized to appear in that character; whether, in fact, the whole is not to be regarded as a work of fraud; especially since we know, that when the crusades had laid open a more free communication betwixt the East and the West, the credulity of the West was often imposed upon by such fraudulent pretensions. Still, we should not be authorized on these grounds to call in question the existence of such a line of sacerdotal kings passing under the common name of John. It is possible that Nestorians baptized the king, and then gave him priestly consecration; and that at baptism he received the name John,—particularly because this was the name of the Nestorian patriarch at that time. Both name and office may then have passed down to his successors. Occasion may have been given for associating the sacerdotal and kingly offices together in one man by ideas and tendencies already existing in those districts at an earlier period—ideas and tendencies which afterwards reappeared among this people under another form, in Lamaïsism. In recent times, however, a more careful examination into the history and the relations of the Chinese empire has led to a different interpretation of this story.\* The kings of Keraït

the truth is, that some actual occurrence lies at bottom of the story, or that this account is a mere imitation of other similar ones, as that respecting the conversion of the Iberians, see vol. II.

\* Schlosser's Weltgeschichte, iii. ii. l. s. 269. Ritter's Geographie ii. ii.

were vassals of the vast Chinese empire, and as such they bore, in addition to their proper names, the character and title of "Vam," or "Vang." Now this latter title, joined with the Tartaric "Khan," gave origin to the name "Vam-Khan," or "Ung-Khan." It is supposed, then, that the legend respecting these kings, who all call themselves John, proceeded from a misconception, or mutilation, of that twofold title; while the legend respecting their uniting the offices of priest and king may have originated in a transfer of religious notions, already current among these nations at an earlier period, into a Christian form. Thus we might be led to regard the whole story concerning the conversion of the princes of Keraït and their subjects as a legend which originated in misconception and exaggeration, without the least foundation of historical truth. But as the report in the above-mentioned letter of the Nestorian metropolitan, respecting the conversion of that Tartarian prince, is confirmed in all essential points by the narratives of Western missionaries and travellers belonging to the thirteenth century, who had, some of them, long resided in those districts, and were not accustomed to exaggerate; so we regard the statement that princes of Keraït were converted by Nestorians to Christianity, that is, led to the outward profession of it, and to the adoption of Christian usages, and that such a Christianity was transmitted in their families, as a fact sufficiently well established, however uncertain may be the rest of the story.

At all events, an end was put to the empire of these so-called sacerdotal kings, probably under the fourth of the dynasty, by the great revolution in 1202, which, somewhat later, shook not only Asia but Europe. The head of one of the subordinate tribes under this empire, khan Temudschin, revolted. The king of Keraït lost, in the struggle which ensued, his kingdom and his life, and Temudschin became, under the name of Dschingiskhan, founder of the great Mongolian empire. It is said, however, that he married the daughter of the slain priest-

Bd. 1. s. 257. Schmidt, in the note contained in the above-mentioned *Geschichte der Ostmongolen*, s. 283. Gieseler who adopts this view has endeavoured to make this derivation probable, by supposing that the Nestorians confounded the foreign Tartarian words with others of like sound in the Semitic dialects, Jochanan and Chohen; see *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1837, 2 h. s. 354.

king; and that Rabbanta,\* a Nestorian monk, rose to great authority and influence; but we ought not to attribute too much importance to statements like these. The religious interest, as a general thing, was amongst the Mongols an altogether subordinate concern; their only article of faith was the recognition of one Almighty God, the Creator of the world, and of the great khan, his son, whom he sent over all the kingdoms of the world, and whom all must obey. This one fundamental article left room, indeed, for a great deal besides, which might be taken from other quarters, and incorporated with it. The religion of these tribes was a rude monotheism, which took but a slight hold on the religious interest; the belief in one God, who was held off at an immense distance,—a belief affording but little to occupy the thoughts or feelings of the human mind; and into the void thereby left for the religious nature, an entrance was left open for all manner of superstition. The religious need would necessarily strive to fill up the chasm between that sublime and distant Deity, floating before the mind in dim presentiment, and the life of man in all its contraction and feebleness; and it was precisely here that all forms of superstition were enabled to find a foothold. Idols and amulets, fabricated by their own hands, laid stronger hold on the affections and the imaginations of the people, than that vague belief in one God, the creator of the universe. In this manner, it was possible that, under the above-mentioned single article of faith, different religions,† that is, their forms and usages, with which a superstitious sort of coquetry was practised, might subsist side by side. Indeed, a frequent change of religious usages was particularly agreeable to the taste of these tribes of men; and thus it happened that Christian, Mohammedan, and Buddhist rites and usages were afterwards admitted amongst them, and tolerated together. Nestorian priests long wandered about among these nations; and these people required nothing more

\* Certainly not a proper name, but a mixture of two titles of honour from different languages, viz.: the Syrian Rabban, and the Turkish Atta, father. See Abel-Rémusat in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, T. VI. an. 1822, p. 413.

† The J. de Plano Carpini, shortly to be mentioned, makes, concerning the Mongols, the correct remark: "*Quia de cultu Dei nullam legem observant, neminem adhuc, quod intelleximus, coegerunt suam fidem vel legem negare.*"



than such an adoption of Christian forms, which they represented as an embracing of Christianity. At the same time the Mongolian princes, induced by motives of political interest, and seeking to form alliances with Christian nations against the Mohammedans,—often represented themselves as more inclined to Christianity than they really were; or else, with a view to flatter the Christian princes of the East, who in a certain sense did them homage, accommodated themselves, in the expression of their religious opinions, to the views of those whom they addressed.

Under Oktaikhan, the successor of Dschingiskhan, the armies of the Mongols threatened to deluge Europe, through Russia, Poland, Bohemia, and Silesia; while the Christian nations were prevented from adopting common measures of defence by the quarrels between the pope and the emperor Frederick the Second. This led pope Innocent the Fourth to send two embassies to the Mongols, one to charge them, in his name, to desist from their warlike expeditions against the Christian nations, and the other to make an attempt to convert them to Christianity. Both were ill-judged; for of what avail was such an injunction, backed up by nothing else? What signified the word of a pope amongst Mongols? And as to the other object—of gaining them over to Christianity, a single embassy could do nothing towards its accomplishment; while the instruments chosen by the pope for this business possessed neither the character nor the information necessary for performing the task imposed on them. In the year 1245, four Dominicans are said to have visited the commander-in-chief of the Mongols in Persia, and three Franciscans to have repaired to the great khan himself. The former,\* at whose head stood the monk Ascelin, were altogether unfitted for the business they undertook, being utterly ignorant both of the manners and of the language of these nations, as well as utterly destitute of the versatility of mind necessary for acquiring such knowledge. Offence was taken, in the first place, because they had not, according to the Oriental custom, brought presents with them. Then, to obtain an audience from the commander-in-chief, it was made a condition that they should pay obeisance to him by three several prostrations. The scruple which they

\* The report of their mission by one of the party. Simon of St. Quintin, set forth in Vincentius de Bauvais. *Speculum historiale*, l. XXXI. c. 40.

raised, that this would be a mark of idolatrous homage, was removed, it is true, by Guiscard of Cremona, a monk familiar with the manners of the East, whom they met with at Tiflis ; and who explained to them that nothing of this kind was associated with the act in the customs of these nations. But when he informed them, at the same time, that it would be a mark of homage paid by the pope and the church of Rome to the great khan, they declared themselves resolved to die rather than subject the church of Rome and Christendom to such a disgrace in the sight of the nations of the East. The Tartars looked upon it as exceedingly strange, that, adoring as they did the sign of the cross in wood and stone, they could pay no such mark of respect to the great commander, whom the khan would not hesitate to honour as he did himself. They looked upon this refusal as a serious insult to the dignity of the khan, in his representative ; and it was only by a fortunate turn of circumstances that the monks escaped being put to death. Finally, they were required to go and meet the great khan himself, to place in his hands the pope's letter, convince themselves, by their own observation, of his unlimited power and matchless glory, and draw up a report of the same to the pope. To this Ascelin replied, that as his lord the pope knew nothing about the name of the khan, and had not commanded him to inquire after that personage, but to accost the first army of the Tartars whom he should meet, so he was not bound, and neither was he inclined, to make a journey to the khan. This style of expressing himself with regard to the relation of the pope to the Tartarian monarch, provoked afresh the displeasure of the Tartars. "Has the pope, then," said they, "subdued as many kingdoms and vast empires as the great khan, the son of God? Has the name of the pope spread as widely as that of the great khan, who is feared from the East to the West?" Upon this, Ascelin explained to them that the pope, as the successor of St. Peter, to whom Christ had intrusted the government of the entire church, possessed the highest authority among men ; but of such an authority the Tartars could form no conception, and in vain did Ascelin resort to various illustrations and examples for the purpose of making the thing plain to them.\*

\* Ascelino multis modis et exemplis explanante, illi tanquam brutales homines nullatenus intelligere valuerunt plenarie.

The letter of the pope was then translated first into Persian, thence into the Tartarian language, and placed before the commander-in-chief; and the monks, after being detained for several months, finally obtained permission to go home, and at the same time a brief, haughty reply to the pope's letter was placed in their hands. It ran thus:—"Whereas, it is God's immutable decree, that all who come personally to show their submission to the great khan, whom God has made lord over the whole world, should remain on their own soil and territory, but the rest be destroyed; therefore let the pope take care to inform himself of this, if he wishes to retain his country." The Franciscans, with whom went Johannes de Plano Carpini, an Italian,\* directed their course to Tartary and the great khan through Russia; and their journey lying through desolate regions and steppes, which they had to traverse on horseback, often at the greatest speed and without halting, was one attended with the severest deprivations and hardships. These monks seemed to be better qualified for their business than the first; Johannes de Plano Carpini, in particular, by his extensive earlier travels, by the important offices which he had filled in his order, and the superior tact he had thereby acquired, seemed much better prepared for it. Less stiff in their prejudices, they could more easily enter into foreign customs and modes of thinking, and hence showed themselves quite ready to make presents, after the Oriental fashion, of the few articles they brought with them; nor did they hesitate to go through the ceremony of thrice bowing the knee, as a customary mark of respect to those in power. When they arrived at the khan's court, Oktaikhan had died, and they were present at the coronation of his successor, Gaiuk. They also found here Nestorian priests, who were maintained by the khan, and who performed their worship before his tents; but assuredly it was an exaggeration, intended or unintended, on the part of the Christians in immediate attendance on the khan, when they told the monks that he himself would soon embrace Christianity.† Besides giving them a letter to the

\* Extracts from his report in Vincentius de Beauvais, lib. XXXI. The same was first published complete by D'Avezac. Paris, 1838.

† The words of J. de Plano Carpini, in the complete edition of his report, mentioned in the previous note § xii. p. 370: "Dicebant etiam nobis Christiani, qui erant de familia ejus, quod credebant firmiter, quod

pope, he proposed to send back with them envoys of his own ; a proposal which, for various prudential reasons, they thought proper to decline. In other respects this embassy proved as fruitless as the former.

The crusades, in various ways, brought the Christians\* of the West into contact with the Mongols.\* The leaders of the Mongols were sometimes induced by motives of policy to court the alliance of the Western princes against their common enemy the Mohammedans ; or they ambitiously affected the distinction of being acknowledged, even by those princes, as their liege lords and masters. There were, however, roving about in the East many deceivers, who represented themselves as envoys from the Mongols, as well as from others ; and in their names expressed opinions, and made treaties, such as had never been dreamed of by those rulers. At the same time, however, the Mongol princes themselves, doubtless, contrived that many things should be said in their name which they afterwards refused to acknowledge as having ever proceeded from them. Thus that pious king, Louis the Ninth of France, while residing, in the time of his crusade, on the isle of Cyprus, heard many exaggerated stories about the inclination of the Mongolian princes to favour Christianity, which induced him to send them ambassadors with presents.

Among these ambassadors, the most distinguished was the Franciscan William de Rubruquis, who undertook a journey of this sort in the year 1253. He visited the Mongol general and prince Sartach, his father Batu, and the great khan of the Mongols himself, the Mangukhan. He penetrated as far as Caracorum, the renowned capital of this empire, the ancient residential city of the above-mentioned priest-kings. From his report of this journey we discover that he was a man less prone to credulity than other monks of his time, more inclined and better qualified to examine into facts ; and it is

debet fieri Christianus et de hoc habent signum apertum, quoniam ipse tenet clericos Christianos et dat eis expensas, Christianorum etiam capellam semper habet ante majus tentorium ejus, et cantant publice et aperte, et pulsant ad horas secundum morem Græcorum, ut alii Christiani, quantacunque sit ibi multitudo Tatarorum vel etiam hominum aliorum, quod non faciunt alii duces."

\* See the Essay of Abel-Rémusat: "Rapports des princes Chrétiens avec le grand empire des Mongols," in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, T. VI. p. 398, 1822.

through him we receive the first certain and accurate information respecting the religious condition of these nations, and respecting their relation to Christianity. In piety and Christian knowledge he was far superior to the Oriental monks and ecclesiastics who wandered about among these tribes ; and his piety, his intrepidity, and his insight into the essence of Christianity, as viewed from the position held by his own church, fitted him beyond others to act as a missionary among these nations. When he came into those districts, where the kingdom of Prester John once had its seat, he perceived how exaggerated had been the accounts given of that kingdom by the Nestorians.\* He says that, with the exception of a few Nestorians, there was nobody who knew anything about Prester John. He found the Nestorians widely dispersed in these regions, and filling important posts in the Tartarian court;† but of the Nestorian clergy he gives a very sad account. "They are," he observes, "thoroughly ignorant ; and though they repeat the liturgical forms, and possess the sacred books in the Syriac language, they understand nothing about them. They sing like illiterate monks that have no understanding of Latin ; hence they are all corrupt in their morals and wicked in their lives, great usurers and drunken sots. Some of them, who live among the Tartars, keep, like the latter, several wives."‡ It was quite enough for such people, if they could make their mechanical prayers and ceremonies pass current at the Tartarian court, so as to procure for themselves presents, the means of living, and influence. The khan Mangu was accustomed to avail himself of the opportunity furnished by the Christian, Mohammedan, and pagan festivals, to give entertainments. On these occasions the Nestorian priests first presented themselves in their clerical robes, offered up prayers for the khan, and pronounced a blessing over his cups ;

\* He says of Prester John, out of whom he makes a Nestorian priest, who had raised himself to be king : "Les Nestoriens disaient de lui choses merveilleuses, mais beaucoup plus qu'il n'y avait en effet, car c'est la coutume des Nestoriens de ces pays là, de faire un grand bruit de peu de chose, ainsi qu'ils ont fait courir partout le bruit, que Sartach était chrétien, aussi bien que Mangu-Cham et Ken-Cham, à cause seulement, qu'ils font plus d'honneur aux chrétiens, qu'à tous les autres, toutefois il est très-certain, qu'ils ne sont pas chrétiens." See his report in the collection of Bergeron, T. I. c. 19. .

† L. c. p. 31, 60, 67.

‡ L. c. c. 28, p. 60.

next, the Mohammedan priests did the same; last of all came the pagans,\* by which, perhaps, we are to understand the Buddhist priests, for there are many indications that Buddhism had already spread into these regions—a thing, indeed, which might have taken place, even at a much earlier period, through missions and pilgrimages of the Buddhists, who were quite zealous in spreading the doctrines of their religion.† At this court he met with a poor weaver from Armenia, who called himself a monk,‡ and pretended before the people that he came from Palestine, in obedience to a special divine revelation.§ By his sanctimonious airs, his quackery, and boasted wonder-working medicines, this person had contrived to acquire considerable influence and property at the court of the khan, especially among the women.¶ In the city of Caracorum he saw twelve idol-temples belonging to different nations, two mosques for Mohammedans, and one church. In this Mongol capital he distributed the sacrament of the Supper, on Easter-Day, to a large number of Christians, who had met together here from various countries, and were eager to enjoy that means of grace of which they had long been deprived. To more than sixty persons, moreover, he administered baptism.¶¶ After having resided for some time at the court, he requested of the great khan a decisive answer to the question, whether he might be permitted to remain in the country as a missionary, or whether he must return home. In consequence of this, on the Sunday before Whitsuntide of the year 1253, he was, in the name of the khan, closely questioned respecting the object for which he had come, by certain officers of the khan's court, among whom were to be found a few Saracens. After he had explained the reasons which had led him to extend his journey so far, he declared that the only object he

\* Rubruquis writes, c. 36, p. 78: "Tant les uns que les autres suivent sa cour, comme les mouches à miel font les fleurs, car il donne à tous et chacun lui désire toutes sortes de biens et de prospérités, croyant être de ses plus particuliers amis."

† Rubruquis says, c. 28, p. 60: "Les prêtres idolâtres de ce pays là portent de grands chapeaux ou coqueluchons jaunes et il y a entre eux aussi, ainsi que j'ai ouï dire, certains hermites ou anachorètes, qui vivent dans les forêts et les montagnes, menant une vie très-surprenante et austère." In which characters we cannot fail to recognize a Buddhist element.

‡ L. c. c. 38.

¶ L. c. p. 102, 133.

§ L. c. c. 48, p. 133.

¶ L. c. c. 42, p. 102.

had in view was to preach the word of God to the Mongols, if they were willing to hear it. He was asked what word of God he proposed to preach to them ; for they supposed that by the word of God he meant certain predictions of good fortune, somewhat of the same sort with those with which many of the wandering ecclesiastics and priests were accustomed to flatter them. But he told them, "The word of God is this (Luke xii. 48), 'Unto whomsoever God has given much, of him shall much be required ; and unto whomsoever God has intrusted less, of him less shall be required ; and he to whom most is intrusted, is also loved most.' Now, on the khan God had bestowed the most ample abundance of good things ; for of all that greatness and might of which he was possessed, he was indebted for nothing to idols ; but for all to God, the creator of heaven and earth, who has all the kingdoms of the world in his hands, and, on account of men's sins, suffers them to pass over from one nation to another. Therefore, if the khan loved God, nothing would be wanting to him ; but, if he conducted himself otherwise, he might be sure that God would call him to a strict account for everything, even to the last penny." Here one of the Saracens asked, "Whether there was a man in the world who did not love God ?" "He who loves God," replied Rubruquis, "keeps his commandments ; and he who does not keep his commandments, does not love him." Upon this they asked him, "Whether he had ever been in heaven, so as to know what God's commandments are?" "No," said he, "but God has communicated them from heaven to men, who sought after that which is good ; and he himself came down from heaven for the purpose of teaching them to all men. In the sacred Scriptures we have all his words, and we find out by men's works whether they observe them or not." Upon this they put him the ensnaring question, "Whether he thought that Mangukhan kept God's commandments, or not?" But he adroitly evaded the dilemma, contriving, while he said nothing but the truth, to avoid uttering a word which could be interpreted to the khan's disadvantage. "If he wished," he said, "to lay before the khan himself, if he pleased, all the commandments of God ; and then he could judge for himself whether he kept them or not." The next day the khan declared that, whereas there were scattered among his subjects, Christians, Mohammedans, and worshippers of idols, and each

party held their own law to be the best; therefore it was his pleasure that the advocates of the three religions should appear before him, and each hand in a written account of his law; so that, by comparing them together, it might be determined, which was the best. "I thanked God," says Rubruquis,\* "that it had pleased him to touch the khan's heart, and bring him to this good decision. And, since it is written that a servant of the Lord should be no brawler, but gentle, showing meekness to all men, and apt to teach; therefore I replied, that I was ready to give an account of my Christian faith to any man who required it of me." In the religious conference which followed, Rubruquis showed immediately his great superiority to the Nestorians. The Nestorians proposed that they should commence the disputation with the Mohammedans; but Rubruquis thought it would be much better to begin with the idolaters, inasmuch as the Christians agreed with the Mohammedans in the faith in one God, and could therefore, on this point, make common cause with them against the idolaters. Furthermore, it was the intention of the Nestorians to prove the doctrine of one God, against the idolaters, from Holy Writ; but Rubruquis explained to them the impossibility of effecting anything in that way, for their opponents would deny the authority of the Scriptures, and would oppose to their testimony other authorities. As they had shown themselves so inexpert in these preliminary matters, it was agreed that he should speak first, and in case he were foiled in the argument, they should follow him up and endeavour to better it. On holy eve before Whitsuntide the disputation was held. The khan had previously caused it to be announced, that, on penalty of death to the transgressor, neither party should dare to injure the other, or to excite disturbances. Three secretaries of the khan, a Christian, a Mohammedan, and an idolater, were to preside as umpires over the debate.

Rubruquis endeavoured to prove, in opposition to the idolaters, the necessity of recognizing one Almighty God, the creator of all things. They, on the other hand, being addicted to a certain dualism, wished to have the difficulty solved, how evil could possibly proceed from this one God. Rubruquis, however, refused to be drawn into that question;

\* L. c. c. 45.



“for,” said he, “before men can enter into any discussion respecting the origin of evil, it would be necessary first to settle the question, *What is evil?*” Thus he compelled them to return to the main point. As to the Mohammedans, they evaded the discussion, declaring that they held the law of the Christians, and all that the gospel teaches, to be true; and as they acknowledged also one God, whom, in all their prayers, they besought to give them grace to die like the Christians, so they were not inclined to enter into any dispute with them. Perhaps the Mohammedans merely wished that it should not appear before the idolaters as if there were any dispute between the worshippers of one God, and hence chose on the present occasion to lay stress on that alone which they held in common with the Christians. Perhaps Rubruquis put more into their reply than it really contained.

He had already heard that the khan had determined to dismiss him; and in a second audience, on the festival of Whitsuntide, the decision was announced to him:—“We, Mongols,” said the khan to him at this interview, “believe there is but one God, by whom we live and die, and to whom our hearts are wholly directed.” “God give you grace to do so,” said Rubruquis, “for, without his grace, it cannot be done.” When, by means of his interpreter, the khan gathered the sense of these words, as well as the former could express it, said he, “As God has given many fingers to the hand, so he has appointed different ways of salvation for man. To the Christians he has given the Holy Scriptures, but they do not strictly observe what is prescribed therein; nor can they find it written there that one class should censure others.” He asked Rubruquis whether he found that in the Scriptures. He said “No;” and then added—“but I also told you, from the first, that I would enter into controversy with no man.” The khan then proceeded:—“I say, God gave you the Holy Scriptures, whose commandments you do not keep; but to us he has given our soothsayers:\* we do whatsoever they prescribe to us, and live in peace with one another.” The khan was careful to avoid entering into any farther conversation with Rubruquis, as the latter wished, on religion; but simply made known to

\* A sort of people, who pretended to understand soothsaying, astrology, and magic, who were consulted on all affairs of state, and directed all religious lustrations

him his command that he should now leave the country, for the purpose of conveying his answer to the letter of king Louis the Ninth. Rubruquis declared his readiness to obey; but at the same time begged that he might be permitted, after having delivered the letters, to return; especially, as in the city of Bolak there were many of his subjects and servants who spoke the French language, and who were in want of priests to preach to them, and also to impart to them and to their children the sacraments according to the principles of their religion, and he would be glad to settle among them. The khan, avoiding a direct reply to this request, proposed a query. He asked Rubruquis if he felt certain then that his king intended to send him back again. To this Rubruquis replied, that he did not know what the king's will might be; but he had perfect liberty from him to go wherever he thought it necessary to preach the word of God, and it seemed to him there was an urgent need of his labours in these countries. The khan dismissed him, however, without a definite answer to his request, and silence here was tantamount to a refusal. Rubruquis concludes his account of this final interview with the remark, "I thought that, had my God bestowed on me the gift to work such miracles as Moses did, I might perhaps have converted the great khan."

By these Mongols two great empires were founded, where their government must have had an important influence on the situation of the Christian church. One was the empire founded by the khan's brother, Hulagu, after the year 1258, in *Persia*; the other, the principal Mongol empire in *China*. Within the former, indeed, was the original seat of the Nestorian church, where it had already been favoured by the Moham-medans. The new conqueror was induced by his wife, a Nestorian Christian, to favour Christianity still more. Besides, there were matrimonial alliances of the succeeding princes, with the families of the Byzantine emperors, and political interests which brought them into relation with the European princes; and they were sometimes led thereby to represent themselves as still more inclined to Christianity than was really the case. The popes, down to the close of the present period, availed themselves of the opportunity furnished by these relations to send monks as missionaries to Persia; but the favour thus shown to Christianity excited a jealousy so much the

more violent on the part of the Mohammedan class of the people, and a contest arose between them and the Christian party which terminated in a complete victory on the side of the former, and violent persecutions of Christianity.

As it regards the principal empire of the Mongols in China, it is to be remarked that the religion of this people here obtained for the first time a determinate shaping, in the form of Lamaïsm, the creation of a hierarchy which sprang out of Buddhism. The Mongols could not withstand the influence of the elements of culture already existing in that country. Kobraikhan, the founder of this empire, distinguished himself above the earlier Mongol princes as a friend of education. In religion, he seems to have fallen in with a certain eclectic tendency. He had a respect for all religious institutions, and especially for Christianity, though he was very far from being himself a Christian.

His court was visited by two merchants belonging to the Venetian family of the Poli: they were favourably received, and resided with him for some time. He finally sent them back to Europe, in company with a man of his own court, with a commission to procure for him, from the pope, a hundred learned men, who should be well instructed in Christianity; but their return from Rome was delayed by the two years' vacancy which befel the papal chair in 1272. Gregory the Tenth having been elected pope in 1274, sent them back to China with two learned Dominicans; and one of the two Venetians took with him his son Marcus, then fifteen years old. The young man made himself accurately acquainted with the languages and customs of those nations: he gained the particular favour of Kobraikhan, was employed by him on various occasions, and, after his return in 1295,\* composed his account of these regions, from which we obtain our best knowledge respecting the state of Christianity in the same. A person who professed to be a Christian (probably after the Nestorian fashion) had rebelled against Kobraikhan. He mounted the cross on his banner, and moreover employed several Christians in his service. The Jews and Saracens in the army of Kobraikhan took occasion from this, after that rebel had been conquered, to attack Christianity. "Here,"

\* De regionibus orientalibus, libri III.

said they, "is seen the weakness of Christ: he could not procure his friends the victory." But Koblaikhan, when the Christians complained to him of these reflections, took their part. "It is true," said he, "the rebel did look for aid to the Christian's God; but He, being a good and righteous God, would not uphold wickedness." And he forbade, for the future, all such calumnious remarks on the God of the Christians, and on the cross.\*

At the close of the thirteenth century, and in the beginning of the fourteenth, a man laboured in these districts, in whom we recognize the pattern of a true missionary,—the Franciscan John de Monte Corvino. He seems to have appeared first in Persia, in the city of Tauris (Tabris). From Persia he travelled, in the year 1291, to India† where he remained thirteen months. He was accompanied by the Dominican Nicholas de Pistorio, who died there. In different districts he succeeded in baptizing a hundred persons; and in the second letter which he wrote to Europe, he declared it as his belief, that "great results might be expected to follow the preaching of the gospel in those regions, if substantial men of the order of the Dominicans or Franciscans would come there." From India he travelled to China; and at length settled down in the capital and residence of the great khan, the city of Cambalu (Pekin). In two letters, written in the years 1305 and 1306, he drew up, for the members of his order, a brief report of his adventures and labours.‡ During eleven years he had laboured entirely alone, when he was joined, in the year 1303, by Arnold, a Franciscan from Cologne. In addition to other obstacles, he had to encounter much opposition from the Nestorians, who would not suffer any man to move a step if he refused to join their party. They invented many false charges against him, which were often the means of bringing him into great peril. He was frequently obliged to defend himself before the courts, till at length by one confession, his innocence was clearly proved; and the khan (Kob-lai's successor, Timur-khan), provoked at his false accusers,

\* See Marco Polo, lib. II. c. 6.

† Regiones sunt pulcherrimæ, plenæ aromatibus et lapidibus pretiosis, sed de fructibus nostris parum habent.

‡ First published in Wadding's *Annals*, T. VI.; then in Moshcim's *Historia eccles. Tartaror*

punished them with banishment. He found that it was not in his power, indeed, to convert the Chinese emperor, to whom he brought a letter from the pope; but still that potentate treated him with favour, and did the Christians many acts of kindness.\*

This distinguished man, displaying the wisdom of a genuine missionary, spared no pains in giving the people the word of God in their own language, and in encouraging the education of the children, as well as training up missionaries from among the people themselves. He translated the New Testament and the Psalms into the Tartar language, had these translations copied in the most beautiful style, and made use of them in preaching.† He purchased, one at a time, a hundred and fifty boys, under the ages of seven and eleven, who were as yet utterly ignorant of any religion; baptized them, gave them a Christian education, and taught them Latin, Greek, and psalmody. Already during the first years of his residence in Cambalu, he was enabled to build a church, in which, with the assistance of those boys who had been trained up by himself, he recited the liturgy, so that he could truly say, "I hold divine service with a troop of babes and sucklings."‡ In this church he set up six pictures, representing stories from the Old and New Testaments, together with explanatory remarks in the Latin, Persian, and Tartar languages, for the instruction of the uneducated people.§ It gave him great satisfaction when he found it in his power to erect a second church in the vicinity of the emperor's palace. A rich and pious Christian merchant, whose acquaintance he had formed in Persia, Peter de Lucalongo, purchased a piece of property on this site, and made him a present of it. This church, which he built in the year 1305, stood so near the walls of the palace,|| that the emperor in his private cabinet could hear the church

\* Qui tamen nimis inveteratus est idolatria, sed multa beneficia præstat Christianis.

† Quæ feci scribi in pulcherrima litera eorum, et scribo et lego et prædico in patenti et manifesto testimonium legis Christi.

‡ Cum conventu infantium et lactentium divinum officium facio. Practice had to supply the place of a breviary provided with notes. Et secundum usum cantamus, quia notatum officium non habemus.

§ Ad doctrinam rudium, ut omnes linguæ legere valeant.

| Inter curiam et locum nostrum via sola est, distans per jactum lapidis a porta Domini Chamis.

psalmody; \* and the emperor took great delight in the singing of children. Monte Corvino now divided the boys between the two churches. He had during his residence in this place baptized from five to six thousand; and he believed that, had it not been for the many plots laid against him by the Nestorians, he would have succeeded in baptizing above thirty thousand. In the first years of his residence in that place, he met with a certain prince, George, a descendant of the priest-kings. This person was persuaded by him to pass over from the Nestorian to the Catholic church. He conferred on him the inferior ecclesiastical consecration; after which the prince assisted him, dressed in his royal robes, in performing divine worship. This prince had induced a large portion of his people to embrace the faith of the Catholic church, had built a magnificent church, and caused it to be called after a Roman name. It had also been his intention to translate the whole Roman liturgy into the language of his people, and introduce it into his church; but he died in the year 1299, too early to accomplish his design. He left behind him a son, still lying in the cradle. This son was baptized by Monte Corvino, who, as his god-father, called him after his own name, John.

But the Nestorians now succeeded in once more obtaining the mastery in this country; and all that had been done by Monte Corvino in the interest of the Catholic church fell to the ground. "Being alone," he wrote, "and not permitted to leave the emperor, it was out of my power to visit churches situated at a distance of twenty-days journey; nevertheless, if a few good helpers and fellow-labourers should come, I hope in God that all our hopes will be made good, for I still retain the privilege given me by the deceased king George." For two years he had access to the emperor's court, and, as papal legate, was more honoured by him than any other ecclesiastic.† He was convinced, that with two or three more assistants to stand by him, he might have succeeded in baptizing the em-

\* In camera sua potest audire voces nostras, et hoc mirabile factum longe lateque divulgatum est inter gentes et pro magno erit, sicut disponet et adimplebit divina clementia.

† Ego habeo in curia sua locum et viam ordinariam intrandi et sedendi sicut legatus Domini Papæ, et honorat me super omnes alios prælatos, quocunque nomine censeatur."

peror himself. In his two letters he urgently begged for such assistants, but they should be brethren, who would seek to stand forth as examples, and not to make broad their phylacteries. Matthew xxiii. 5. "I am already become old," says he in one of those letters, "but I have grown grey by labours and hardships, rather than by the number of my years, for I have lived but fifty-eight years." The pope made this excellent man archbishop of Cambalu, and sent seven other Franciscans to assist him in his labours.

The crusades promoted intercourse between the East and the West, but the connection thus brought about between the Mohammedan and Christian races was not of such a kind as to prepare the way for the exertion of any religious influence on the former; although that which Mohammedanism had already borrowed from Judaism and Christianity, as well as the intrinsic contradictions contained within itself, might have furnished the means and occasions for such an influence. Moreover, the vicious lives of a large portion of those who were led to the East by the crusades, were but poorly calculated to produce on Mohammedans a favourable impression of the religion which these men professed. But it is apparent from individual examples, how much *might* have been effected here by the gospel, if it had been preached with Christian enthusiasm, and illustrated by holy living. When a Christian army, in the year 1219, was besieging the city of Damietta (not far from the present Damietta),\* in Egypt, Francis of Assisi† stood forth in that army as a preacher of repentance, and from thence he was impelled by his burning zeal to go over to the Mohammedan army, which had arrived for the relief of the city. He was dragged as a captive before Malek al Kamel, the sultan of Egypt. The sultan, however, received him with respect, allowed him to preach several successive days before himself and his officers, and heard him with great attention. He then sent him back, in the most honourable manner, to the camp of the Franks, saying to him, as he took leave, "Pray for me, that God may enlighten me, and enable me to hold firmly to that religion which is most pleasing to him." This story we have from an eye-witness, Jacob

\* See Wilken's Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, Bd. vi. p. 186.

† Of whom we shall speak more at large farther on.

de Vitry,\* bishop of Acco (Ptolemais, St. Jean d'Acre), in Palestine afterwards cardinal, who was then present in the army there assembled.† In a letter written immediately after the capture of Damietta, in which he drew up for the regular canonicals of Liege, to which order he once belonged, a report of that important event, he gives at the same time this account

\* à Vitriaco.

† See his *Historia occidentalis*, c. 32. Bonaventura, in his life of St. Francis, relates that, in the thirteenth year after his conversion, which would coincide very nearly with the time mentioned in the text, Francis went to Syria, for the purpose of visiting the sultan of Babylon, not fearing the danger, although at that time the price of a gold Byzantine was set upon the head of every Christian. When he was led before the sultan, he spoke with such power, that the sultan was carried completely away by him, heard him with the greatest pleasure, and requested him to remain longer with him. Thereupon, Francis said to him, that if he and his people would embrace Christianity, he would gladly consent, from love of the Saviour his Master, to remain with him; but if he could not consent to this, then he might order a large fire to be kindled; into this he (Francis) would enter, along with the Mohammedan priests; and so it would be determined by a judgment of God on which side the true faith was to be found. The sultan objected that none of *his* priests would be ready for that. Whereupon, Francis declared, if the sultan would promise him that he with his people would embrace Christianity in case he should come forth unharmed from the flames, he would enter the fire alone, though, should he be devoured by them, it must be ascribed to his sins; but if the power of God delivered him, then they must recognize Christ as their God and Saviour. The sultan declared he could not venture to accept such a proposal for fear of an uproar amongst the people. He offered Francis, however, many presents, and upon his declining to receive them, requested him to distribute them, for the salvation of the donor's soul, amongst the Christian poor and the churches; but he refused to take them even for this purpose. Something similar is related also by the disciple of Francis, Thomas de Celano, in his *Life of St. Francis*, s. 57. *Acta Sanctor. Mens. Octob. T. II. f. 699.* It is hardly to be doubted, that the same event is here alluded to which Jacob de Vitry relates, the scene only being transferred from Egypt to Syria, and in place of the sultan of Egypt the Sultan of Babylon introduced, by which doubtless is meant the sultan of Damascus, Malek al Moaddhem Isa, a fierce enemy of the Christians; which substitution of persons might the more easily occur, because that sultan also had been to Egypt. The more simple and exact account of the eye-witness is certainly the most trustworthy. The two others, enthusiastic admirers of St. Francis, followed more exaggerated and inaccurate legends. The appeal to a judgment of God is undoubtedly in the spirit of Francis, and the sultan might perhaps have returned such an answer to it. At all events, the agreement of the three accounts in the essential point, vouches for the truth of the fact lying at bottom.



of the labours of Francis.\* He also states, as an eye-witness, that the Mohammedans gladly listened to missionaries of the Franciscan order, when they spoke of the Christian faith, as long as they refrained from reviling Mohammed as a false prophet. But no sooner did they fall into such abuse than they exposed themselves to be severely treated, and even to lose their lives, and were driven away.† Had they, then, united to their glowing zeal a prudent spirit; had they been able to abstain awhile longer from rash polemical disputes; their preaching would perhaps have been followed with happier results.

Among the rare phenomena in the history of missions, may be reckoned the combination of a scientific spirit with earnest zeal for the cause of Christ; the appropriation of science as a means for promoting the spread of the gospel, as an instrument for attacking, on its own chosen grounds, some other form of culture standing in hostility to Christianity. The example of the great Alexandrian church-teachers, who had in this way done so much for the overthrow of that Hellenic culture which furnished a prop for paganism, was forgotten or remained unnoticed; nor was there any call for this method among rude tribes, where it could find no application. But there could be no question about the advantage of employing it for the promotion of missions in those parts where Christianity, in order to find entrance into the minds of a people, must first enter into the contest with some existing culture closely interwoven with a hostile system of religion. We close this history of missions with an account of the labour of an extraordinary individual who, by employing a method of this kind, takes a prominent and peculiar place among the missionaries of this

\* *Epistola Jacobi Aconensis episcopi missa ad religiosos, familiares et notos suos in Lotharingia existentes, de captione Damiatæ.* Here he at last says of Francis: "Cum venisset ad exercitum nostrum, zelo fidei accensus, ad exercitum hostium nostrorum ire non timuit et cum multis diebus Saracenis verbum Domini prædicasset et cum parum profecisset, tunc Soldanus Rex Ægypti ab eo in secreto petiit, ut pro se Domino supplicaret, quatenus religioni, quæ magis Deo placeret, divinitus inspiratus adhereret." Vid. *Gesta Dei per Francos*, ed. Bongars. T. II. f. 1149.

† The words of J. de Vitry in the *Hist. occident. l.c.*: "Saraceni autem omnes fratres minores tam diu de Christi fide et evangelica doctrina prædicantes libenter audiunt, quousque Mahometo, tanquam mendaci et perfido, prædicatione sua manifeste contradicunt. Ex tunc autem eos impie verberantes, et nisi Deus mirabiliter protegeret pæne trucidantes, de civitatibus suis expellunt."

period, and constitutes an epoch in the history of missions generally,—a man distinguished for combining, though he may not have conciliated into harmonious union, moral and intellectual traits very different in their kind, and seldom meeting together in the same person; we mean Raymund Lull, who was born in the island of Majorca in 1236.

Until the age of thirty, he had lived wholly to the world. A stranger to all higher aspirations, he resided at the court of the king of the Balearian islands, where he occupied the post of seneschal. Even after his marriage he continued to pursue pleasures not altogether consistent with conjugal fidelity; and the theme of his poetical compositions was sensual love. But that feeling of Christian piety which, as it moved his age and the people among whom he lived, had been instilled also by education into his early affections, and that not without success, brought on a reaction against the hitherto-governing principle of his life. One night, whilst sitting by his bed, occupied in composing a love-sonnet, the image of Christ on the cross all at once presented itself before his eyes. It made so powerful an impression on him, that he could write no farther. At another time, when he attempted to resume his pen, the same image reappeared, and he was obliged to desist, as before.\* Day and night this image floated before his fancy; nor could he find any means of resisting the impression it made on him. Finally, he looked upon these visions as sent for the purpose of warning him to retire from the world, and to consecrate himself wholly to the service of Christ; but now the question occurred to him, "How can I possibly make the change from the impure life I have led to so holy a calling?" This thought kept him awake whole nights. At

\* We here follow the treatise relating to a portion of the Life of Raymund Lull, which was composed while Lull was still living, by a man who, as it seems, was accurately acquainted with his subject, perhaps the companion of his missionary journeys, published in the *Actis Sanctorum*, at the 31st of June; *Mens. Jun. T. V. f. 661*. More recent accounts (see Wadding's *Annales Franciscan. T. IV. an. 1275. § 4*) state, that an unfortunate love-affair with a lady who was married, and suffering under a cancerous affection, was the first occasion of the change in his religious feelings. As, however, the trustworthy narrative of the unknown writer just referred to mentions nothing of the kind, and we do not know from what source this account was derived, it remains, to say the least doubtful.

last, said he to himself, "Christ is so gentle, so patient, so compassionate;—he invites all sinners to himself; therefore he will not reject *me*, notwithstanding all my sins." Thus he became convinced it was God's will that he should forsake the world and consecrate himself, with his whole heart, to the service of Christ. When this new life, this life animated by the love of God and the Saviour, began to dawn within him, from that moment he was conscious, for the first time, of a new elevation imparted to his whole being. The latent powers of this extraordinary mind, now first stirred in its depths, powers which had hitherto lain dormant, began to discover themselves. The man of warm and excitable feelings, of quick and lively imagination, could now find pleasure in the dry forms of logic; but we must allow that this fertile imagination could bring so much the more meaning into those empty logical forms. And all, in his case, proceeded from that one religious idea, which from this time forward actuated his whole life, gave direction to all his plans, and by which the most heterogeneous aims and endeavours were united together.

Being now resolved to consecrate himself entirely to the service of the Lord, he next pondered upon the best method of carrying this resolution into effect; and he came to a settled conviction that to the Lord Christ no work of his could be more acceptable than that of devoting himself to the preaching of the gospel; in doing which his thoughts were directed particularly to the Saracens, whom the crusaders had attempted in vain to subdue by the sword. But now a great difficulty arose: how could he, an ignorant layman, be fit for such a work? While perplexed in labouring to resolve this difficulty, the thought suddenly occurred to him, that he might write a book serving to demonstrate the truth of Christianity in opposition to all the errors of the infidels; and with this thought was afterwards connected the idea of a universal system of science. The whole suggestion rose up with such strength in his soul that he felt constrained to recognize it as a divine call. Nevertheless, he reasoned with himself, even supposing he were able to write such a book, of what use would it be to the Saracens, who understood nothing but Arabic? Thus the project began already to unfold itself in his mind, of applying to the pope and to the monarchs of Christendom, calling upon them to establish in certain monasteries foundations for study-

ing and acquiring the Arabic tongue, as well as other languages, spoken amongst infidel nations. From such establishments missionaries might go forth to all regions. Thus he came upon the idea of founding linguistic schools for missionary purposes. The day after these thoughts occurred to him, and took so deep hold of his mind, he repaired to a neighbouring church, where with warm tears he besought the Lord, that he, who by his own Spirit had inspired these three thoughts within him, would now lead him on to the execution of the contemplated work in defence of Christianity, to the establishing of those schools for missions and the study of the languages, and finally to the entire dedication of his life to the cause of the Lord. This took place in the beginning of the month of July; but it was not all at once that this new and higher direction of life could gain the absolute ascendancy in his soul. Old habits were still too strong; and so it happened that, during the space of three months, Raymund Lull ceased to occupy himself any longer with these thoughts, upon which he had so eagerly seized at first. Then came the fourth of October, dedicated to the memory of St. Francis; and in the Franciscan church at Majorcæ he heard a bishop preach on St. Francis's renunciation of the world. By this sermon his holy resolutions were again called to mind. He resolved to follow at once the example of St. Francis. Selling his property, of which he retained only as much as sufficed for the support of his wife and children, he gave himself up wholly to the Lord Christ, and left his home with the intention of never returning back to it. His next step was to make pilgrimages to several churches then standing in high consideration, for the purpose of imploring God's blessing, and the intercession of the saints, that he might be enabled to carry out the three thoughts which had been suggested to him in so remarkable a manner.

He now proposed going to Paris, for the purpose of qualifying himself by a course of scientific studies for the accomplishment of his plans; but through the influence of his kinsmen and friends, particularly of that famous canonist, the Dominican Raymund de Pennafort, he was dissuaded from this project. Remaining therefore in Majorcæ, he there began his studies, having first exchanged the rich attire belonging to his former station in life, for a coarser dress. Purchasing a Saracen slave, he made him his instructor in Arabic; and we

cannot but admire the energy and resolution of the man, who, after having spent so many years of his life in society and pursuits of so entirely different a nature, and certainly never applied the powers of his mind to severe thought, could throw himself, at so late a period, into the midst of the driest dialectical studies, and even take delight in them.

At first, Raymund Lull diligently employed himself in tracing the leading outlines of a universal formal science. This was his *Ars major*, or *generalis*, designed as the preparatory work to a strictly scientific demonstration of all the truths of Christianity. We perceive in it, how the religious, and especially the apologetical, interest gave direction to all his thoughts, and how closely he kept his eye fixed on this *one* object, even when moving in the driest tracts of formalism. He was for founding a science, by means of which Christianity might be demonstrated with strict necessity, so that every reasonable mind would be forced to admit its truth. Perhaps he might be flattering himself that a certain means would thus be secured for converting all unbelievers, particularly those whom he chiefly had in view, the Mohammedans, who were wrapped up in the prejudices of their Arabian philosophy. "If he but succeeded," he thought, "in refuting all their objections to Christianity, then, since they would not be able to refute the arguments which he could bring in defence of Christian truth, their learned men and sages must of necessity embrace Christianity."\*

There were two parties, against whom, from the vantage-ground of his much-promising science, he zealously contended : on the one side, against those who looked upon such a science as derogatory to faith, which by the very act of renouncing every attempt to comprehend, preserved its self-denying character and had its merit ;† on the other, against those who, perverted

\* In the *Introductio* to the *Necessaria demonstratio articulorum fidei*, he says : " Rogat Raymundus religiosos et seculares sapientes, ut videant, si rationes, quas ipse facit contra Saracenos approbando fidem Catholicam habeant veritatem, quia si forte aliquis solveret rationes, quæ per Saracenos contra fidem Catholicam opponuntur, cum tamen ipsi rationes, quæ fiunt pro eadem, solvere non valerent, fortificati Saraceni valde literati et sapientes se facerent Christianos."

† Dicunt, quod fides non habet meritum, cujus humana ratio præbet experimentum et ideo dicunt, quod non est bonum, probare fidem, ut non amittatur meritum. Asserentes autem ista et dogmatizantes, quanquam

by the influence of a sceptically inclined Arabian philosophy, took advantage of the supposed opposition between philosophical and theological truth, and while they hypocritically pretended that reason was led captive to obedience of the faith, propagated their dogmas, which were opposed to Christianity and to the doctrine of the church, as philosophical truth. He maintained against such, that although faith proceeded first from a practical root, from the bent of will towards the things of God, and although what was thus appropriated became a source of nourishment and strength to the heart ;\* yet, having this faith, Christians were then required to soar by means of it to a loftier position, so as to attain a knowledge of the solid groundwork, the necessary truths, upon which faith reposes ; so that, what had been at first only a source of nourishment to the heart, would then prove a source of nourishment also to the intellect.† The intellect would always be accompanied in its investigations by faith ; strengthened by that, and emboldened to attempt higher flights, it would continually mount upward, while faith would keep equal step, and ever make increase with the advance of knowledge.‡ It is remarkable that two men of so different a stamp, and both so original, Abelard,§ the man of sober understanding in the twelfth century, and Raymund Lull, who combined logical acumen with a profound mysticism and the warm glow of religious sentiment, in the thirteenth century, should in like manner defend the position of science over against that of faith standing alone. In Lull, however, it was the enthusiastic hope of finding a method of argumentation suited to convince all unbelievers of the truth of Christianity, which constituted the moving spring of his philosophical inquiries.

As he believed it was by a divine suggestion he was first

*magnos se reputent, et quod pejus est ab aliis reputentur, ostendunt se manifestissime ignorantes.*

\* *Ipsa fides, quæ voluntatis firmiter eam credentium erat pabulum et fomentum.*

† *Fides fundamenta, quibus innititur, necessarias scilicet rationes, ministrabit iisdem, ut sint eorum pabulum intellectus.*

‡ *Ipsa fides intellectum in se ipsa fundans eumque investigando continue concomitans et confortans supra intellectus vires et potentiam excandescit, quia fatigari nesciens semper nititur intensius et altius ad credendum, propter quod fides in altius erigitur et meritum credentium ampliatur.*

§ See regarding him on a future page.

impelled to search after a method capable of guiding all to a conviction of the truth of Christianity ; so it was in the solemn hour of devotion that the light first burst in upon him, and disclosed the way in which he might conduct his search with success. He had retired, for eight days, to a mountain, in order that he might there devote himself without disturbance to prayer and meditation. While he was in this solitude, the idea of the above-mentioned *Ars generalis* burst all at once in a clear light upon his soul. Leaving the mountain, he repaired to another spot, and drew out a sketch of the work according to that idea, which he looked upon as a divine revelation. After this, he returned to the mountain; and on the spot where the light first broke in upon his mind, settled himself down as an anchorite, spending about four months there, praying to God night and day, that he would employ him, together with the *Ars generalis* which had there been revealed to him, for his own glory and for the advancement of his kingdom. He published his discovery at Montpelier and at Paris; he delivered lectures on the *Ars generalis*; he translated the work himself into Arabic. His labours in this way extended through a period of nine years. Next, in the year 1275, he prevailed on Jacob, king of the islands Majorca and Minorca, to found on the former of these islands a monastery for the express purpose of constantly supporting in it thirteen Franciscan monks who were to be instructed in the Arabic language, with a view to labour as missionaries amongst the Saracens. In 1286 he went to Rome, for the purpose of persuading pope Honorius the Fourth to approve his plan of establishing such missionary schools in the monasteries everywhere; but when he arrived, that pope was no longer living, and the papal chair was vacant. A second visit to Rome on the same errand was attended with no better success.

Finding that he could not establish, as he wished, a plan of united effort for the promotion of this holy enterprise, he now felt constrained to embark in it by himself, and proceed wholly alone, as a missionary among the infidels. For this purpose he repaired, in the year 1287, to Genoa, and engaged his passage in a ship bound to North Africa. As a great deal had already been heard about the remarkable change which Raymond Lull had experienced, about his ardent zeal to effect the conversion of the infidels, and about the new method of con-

version which, in his own opinion, promised such magnificent results; so his project, when it became known in Genoa, excited great expectations. The ship in which Raymund was to embark, lay ready for the voyage, and his books had been conveyed on board, when his glowing imagination pictured before him, in such lively and terrible colours, the fate which awaited him among the Mohammedans, whether it was to be death by torture or life-long imprisonment, that he could not summon courage enough to go on board. But no sooner had this passed over, than he was visited with remorseful pangs of conscience, to think that he should prove recreant to the holy purpose with which God had inspired him, and occasion such scandal to believers in Genoa; and a severe fit of fever was the consequence of these inward conflicts. While in this state of bodily and mental suffering, he happened to hear of a ship lying in port, which was on the point of starting on a voyage to Tunis; and though in a condition seemingly nearer to death than to life, he caused himself to be conveyed on board with his books. His friends, however, believing he could not possibly stand out the voyage in such a condition, and full of anxiety, insisted on his being brought back; but he grew no better, for the cause of his illness was mental. Some time afterwards, hearing of another ship bound to Tunis, nothing could hinder him now from taking measures to be conveyed on board; and no sooner had the ship got to sea, than he felt himself relieved of the heavy burden which oppressed his conscience; the peace he formerly enjoyed once more returned;\* for he found himself in his proper element. He was engaged in fulfilling the duty, which he recognized as obligatory on him by the divine calling. With the health of his soul, that of the body was soon restored; and to the astonishment of all his fellow-passengers, he felt himself, after a few days, as well as he had ever been in any former part of his life.

Raymund arrived at Tunis near the close of the year 1291 or the beginning of the year 1292, and immediately inviting together the learned scholars among the Mohammedans, explained to them how he had come for the purpose of instituting

\* The unknown author of his *Life* finely remarks: "*Sospitatem conscientia, quam sub nubilatione supradicta se crediderat amisisse, subito lætus in Domino Sancti Spiritus illustratione misericordie recuperavit unum cum sui corporis languidi sœpitate.*"



a comparison between Christianity, of which he possessed an accurate knowledge, as well as of all the arguments employed to defend it, and Mohammedanism; and if he found the reasons to be stronger on the side of the doctrines of Mohammed, he was ready to embrace them. The learned Mohammedans now came around him in constantly increasing numbers, hoping that they should be able to convert him to Mohammedanism. After he had endeavoured to refute the arguments which they brought forward in defence of their religion, said he to them, "Every wise man must acknowledge that to be the true religion which ascribes to God the greatest perfection, which gives the most befitting conception of each single divine attribute, and which most fully demonstrates the equality and harmony subsisting among them all." He then sought to prove that without the doctrine of the trinity, and of the incarnation of the Son of God, men cannot understand the perfection of God, and the harmony between his attributes.\* Thus he would prove to them that Christianity is the only religion conformable to reason.

One of the learned Saracens, more fanatically disposed than the rest, directed the attention of the king to the danger threatened to the Mohammedan faith by Raymund's zeal for making converts; and proposed that he should be punished with death. Raymund was thrown into prison; and already it was determined that he should be put to death, when one of their learned men, possessed of fewer prejudices and more wisdom than the others, interceded in his behalf. He spoke of the respect due to the intellectual ability of the stranger, and remarked, that "as they would praise the zeal of a Mohammedan who should go among the Christians for the purpose of converting them to the true faith; so they could not but honour in a Christian, the same zeal for the spread of that religion which appeared to him to be the true one." These representations had their effect so far as to save Raymund's life; and he was only condemned to banishment from the country. On leaving the prison, he was obliged to endure many insults from the fanatical populace. He was then placed on board the same Genoese vessel in which he had arrived, and which was now about to

\* The arguments by which he supposed that he had demonstrated this, we cannot stop to explain till we come to the section which treats of doctrines.

depart; and at the same time he was informed, that if he ever let himself be seen again in the territory of Tunis, he should be stoned to death. As he hoped, however, by persevering efforts to succeed in converting many of the learned Saracens with whom he had disputed; he could not prevail upon himself, with the earnest desire he felt for their salvation, to abandon this hope quite so soon. Life was not too dear to him to be sacrificed for such an object. Letting the vessel on board which he had been placed sail off without him, he transferred himself to another, from which he sought a chance of getting into Tunis again unobserved. While remaining in this dangerous concealment in the harbour of Tunis, he enjoyed sufficient composure to labour on a work connected with his system of the Universal Science.\* Having tarried here three months without effecting his main object, he finally sailed off with the vessel, and proceeded to Naples. Here he loitered several years, delivering lectures on his new system; till the fame of the pious anchorite, who had lately become pope under the name of Cœlestin the Fifth, inspired in him the hope of being able at length to carry into effect the plan for promoting missionary enterprises, on which his heart had so long been set. But Cœlestin's reign was too short to permit this; and his successor, Boniface the Eighth, possessed but little susceptibility to religious ideas and interests.

During his residence at that time in Rome, in the year 1296, he composed the work previously mentioned, on page 86, in which he sought to show, how all the truths of the Christian faith could be proved by incontestable arguments. In the concluding sentences of this work he expresses that enthusiastic zeal for the spread of the Christian faith, which had moved him to compose it. "Let Christians," says he, "consumed with a burning love for the cause of faith, but consider that, since nothing has power to withstand *the truth*, which by the strength of arguments is mighty over all things, they can, with God's help and by his might, bring back the infidels to the way of faith; so that the precious name of our Lord Jesus, which is in most regions of the world still unknown to the

\* In the month of September, 1292, he commenced writing, in the port of Tunis, his *Tabula generalis ad omnes scientias applicabilis*, as he himself states. See the *Commentarius prævius* to his life, in the *Actis Sanct. Mens. Jun. T. V. f. 645*

majority of men, may be proclaimed and adored; and this way of converting infidels is easier than all others. For, to the infidels, it seems a difficult and dangerous thing to abandon their own belief for the sake of another; but it will be impossible for them not to abandon the faith which is proved to them to be false and self-contradictory, for the sake of that which is true and necessary." And he concludes with these words of exhortation: "With bowed knee and in all humility, we pray that all may be induced to adopt this method; since of all methods for the conversion of infidels, and the recovery of the promised land, this is the easiest and the one most in accordance with Christian charity. As the weapons of the Spirit are far mightier than carnal weapons, so is this method of conversion far mightier than all others." It was on the holy eve before the festival of John the Baptist, that he wrote the above; and hence he added: "As my book was finished on the vigils of John the Baptist, who was the herald of the light, and with his finger pointed to him who is the true light; so may it please our Lord Jesus Christ to kindle a new light of the world, which may guide unbelievers to their conversion; that they with us may go forth to meet the Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be honour and praise, world without end."

Being repulsed at Rome, he endeavoured, for a series of years, to labour wherever an opportunity offered itself. He sought by arguments to convince the Saracens and Jews on the island of Majorca. He went to the isle of Cyprus, and from thence to Armenia, exerting himself to bring back the different schismatic parties of the Oriental church to orthodoxy. All this he undertook by himself, attended only by a single companion, without ever being able to obtain the wished for support from the more powerful and influential men of the church. In the intervals, he delivered lectures on his system in Italian and French universities, and composed many new treatises.\*

Between the years 1306 and 1307, he made another journey to North Africa, where he visited the city<sup>c</sup> of Bugia, which was then the seat of the Mohammedan empire. He stood forth publicly, and proclaimed in the Arabic language, "that

\* It is to be regretted that only a small portion of his works has ever been published, and it is difficult to obtain much of what is published.

Christianity is the only true religion ; the doctrine of Mohammed, on the contrary, false : and this, he was ready to prove to every one." A vast concourse of people collected around him, and he addressed the multitude in an exhortatory discourse. Already many were about to lay hands on him, intending to stone him to death ; when the mufti, who heard of it, caused him to be torn away from the multitude, and brought into his presence. The mufti asked him, how he could act so madly, as to stand forth publicly in opposition to the doctrines of Mohammed ; whether he was not aware that, by the laws of the land, he deserved the punishment of death ? Raymund replied : " A true servant of Christ, who has experienced the truth of the Catholic faith, ought not to be appalled by the fear of death, when he may lead souls to salvation." The mufti, who was a man well versed in the Arabian philosophy, then challenged him to produce his proofs of Christianity as opposed to Mohammedanism. Then Raymund sought to convince him that, without the doctrine of the trinity, the self-sufficiency, the goodness and love of God, could not be rightly understood ; that if that doctrine be excluded, the Divine perfections must be made to depend on that creation which had a beginning in time. The goodness of God cannot be conceived as inactive, said he ; but if you do not adopt the doctrine of the trinity you must say, that till the beginning of the creation God's goodness was inactive, and consequently was not so perfect.\* To the essence of the highest good belongs self-communication ; but this can be understood as a perfect and eternal act only in the doctrine of the trinity. Upon this, he was thrown into a narrow dungeon ; the intercession of merchants from Genoa and Spain procured for him, it is true, some alleviation of his condition ; yet he remained a close prisoner for half a year. Meanwhile, many attempts were made to convert him to Moslemism. The highest honours and great riches were promised him, on condition that he would change his religion ; but to all these advances he replied : " And I promise *you*, if you will forsake this false religion, and believe in Jesus Christ, the greatest riches and everlasting life." It was finally agreed, at the proposal of

\* Tu dicis, quod Deus est perfecte bonus ab æterno et in æternum, ergo non indiget mendicare et facere bonum extra se.

Raymund, that a book should be written on both sides, i. proof of the religion which each party professed, when it would appear evident, from the arguments adduced, which had gained the victory. While Raymund was busily employed in composing such a work, a command was issued by the king, that he should be put on board a ship and sent out of the country.\*

The ship in which he sailed was cast away, in a violent storm, on the coast, not far from Pisa. Part of those on board perished in the waves; Raymund, with his companion, was saved. He was received at Pisa with great honours, and, after having passed through so many hardships, he still continued, although far advanced in years, to prosecute his literary labours with unremitted zeal. At the age of sixty, he toiled on with the enthusiasm of youth to secure the one object which, ever since his conversion, had formed the central aim of his whole life. He says of himself:—"I had a wife and children; I was tolerably rich; I led a secular life. All these things I cheerfully resigned for the sake of promoting the common good and diffusing abroad the holy faith. I learned Arabic;

\* We have from Raymund himself a brief notice of these occurrences in the *Liber, qui est disputatio Raymundi Christiani et Hamar Saraceni*; at the end of which book it is stated that it was finished at Pisa, in the monastery of St. Dominick, in April, A.D. 1308. It was the Saracen Hamar, who, with several others, visited him in the dungeon at Bugia, and disputed with him concerning the advantages of Christianity and Mohammedanism. He says, near the close of this work, "*Postquam Hamar Saracenus recesserat, Raymundus Christianus posuit in Arabico prædictas rationes, et facto libro, misit episcopo Bugiæ (the person at the head of the Mohammedan cultus) rogando, ut sui sapientes viderent hunc librum, et ei responderent. Sed post paucos dies episcopus præcepit, quod prædictus Christianus ejiceretur e terra Bugia et in continenti Saraceni miserunt ipsum in quandam navem, tendentem Genuam, quæ navis cum magna fortuna venit ante portum Pisanum et prope ipsum per decem miliaria fuit fracta et Christianus vix quasi nudus evasit et amisit omnes suos libros et sua bona et ille existens Pisis recordatus fuit prædictarum rationum, quas habuit cum supradicto Saraceno et ex illis composuit hunc librum.*" He sent this book to the pope and the cardinals, that they might learn what arguments the Mohammedans employed to draw away Christians from their faith. He laments to say, that by such arguments, and by the promise of riches and women, they win many to their religion. "*Et quia Christiani non eurant nec volunt auxilium dare Saracenis, qui se faciunt Christianos, inde est quod si unus Saracenus fit Christianus, decem Christiani et plures fiant Saraceni et de hoc habemus experimentum in regno Ægypti, de quo dicitur, quod tertia pars militiæ Soldani fuerit Christiana.*"

I have several times gone abroad to preach the gospel to the Saracens ; I have, for the sake of the faith, been cast into prison and scourged ; I have laboured forty-five years to gain over the shepherds of the church and the princes of Europe to the common good of Christendom. Now I am old and poor, but still I am intent on the same object. I will persevere in it till death, if the Lord himself permits it." He sought to found, in Pisa and Genoa, a new order of spiritual knights, who should be ready, at a moment's warning, to go to war with the Saracens, and for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. He succeeded in exciting an interest in favour of his plan, and in obtaining letters to pope Clement the Fifth, in which this matter was recommended to the head of the church. Pious women and noblemen in Genoa offered to contribute the sum of thirty thousand guilders for this object. He proceeded with these letters to visit pope Clement the Fifth at Avignon ; but his plan met with no encouragement from that pontiff. He next appeared as a teacher at Paris, and attacked with great zeal the principles of the philosophy of Averroes, and the doctrine it taught respecting the opposition between theological and philosophical truth.\* Meanwhile, the time having arrived for the assembling of the general council of Vienne, A.D. 1311, he hoped there to find a favourable opportunity for carrying into effect the plan which for so long a time had occupied his thoughts. He was intent on accomplishing three objects : first, the institution of those linguistic missionary schools, of which we have spoken on a former page ; secondly, the union of the several orders of spiritual knights in a single one, which would not rest till the promised land was recovered ; thirdly, a speedy adoption of successful measures for checking the progress of the principles of Averroes. To secure this latter object, men of suitable intellectual qualifications should be invited to combat those principles, and he himself composed a new work for this purpose. The first he actually obtained from the pope. An ordinance was passed for the establishment of professorships of the Oriental languages ; advising that, in order to promote the conversion of

\* His *Lamentatio seu expostulatio philosophiæ s. duodecim principia philosophiæ*, dedicated to the king of France, which he composed at Paris, in 1310, is directed against the Averroists.

the Jews and the Saracens, professional chairs should be established for the Arabic, Chaldee, and Hebrew languages in all cities where the papal court resided, and also at the universities of Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca. He now could not bear the thought of spending the close of his life at ease in his native land, to which he had returned for the last time. He desired nothing more than to offer up his life in the promulgation of the faith. Having spoken, in one of his works, of natural death, which he ascribed to the diminution of animal warmth, says he, "Thy servant would choose, if it please thee, not to die such a death: he would prefer that his life should end in the glow of love, as thou didst, in love, offer up thy life for us." \* "Thy servant," says he, "is ready to offer up himself, and to pour out his blood for thee. May it please thee, therefore, ere he comes to die, so to unite him to thyself that he, by meditation and love, may never be separated from thee." On the 14th of August, 1314, he crossed over, once more, to Africa. Proceeding to Bugia, he laboured there, at first, secretly, in the small circle of those whom, during his last visit to that place, he had won over to Christianity. He sought to confirm their faith, and to advance them still farther in Christian knowledge. In this way he might no doubt have continued to labour quietly for some time, but he could not resist the longing after martyrdom. He stood forth publicly, and declared that he was the same person whom they had once banished from the country, and exhorted the people, threatening them with divine judgments if they refused, to abjure Mohammedanism. He was fallen upon by the Saracens with the utmost fury. After having been severely handled, he was dragged out of the city, and, by the orders of the king, stoned to death. Merchants from Majorca obtained permission to extricate the body of their countryman from the heaps of stones under which it lay buried, and they conveyed it back, by ship, to their native land. The 30th of June, 1315, was the day of his martyrdom. †

\* The words of Raymund, in his work *De Contemplatione*, c. cxxx. Distinct. 27, f. 299: "*Homines morientes præ senectute moriuntur per defectum caloris naturalis et per excessum frigoris et ideo tuus servus et tuus subditus, si tibi placeret, non vellet mori tali morte, imo vellet mori præ amoris ardore, quia tu voluisti mori tali morte.*"

† We cannot in this place go back to the reports of contemporaries,

We must now cast a glance at the relation of the dispersed Jews to the Christian church.

As it regards the Jews, who were scattered in great numbers in the West, it is to be remarked that the frequent oppressions, injuries, and persecutions which they had to suffer from the fanaticism and cupidity of so-called Christians, were not well calculated to open their minds to the preaching of the gospel; though, through fear, and to escape the sufferings or the death with which they were threatened, they might be induced to submit to the form of baptism, and to put on the profession of Christianity.\* Hermann, a monk of the twelfth century, from the monastery of Kappenberg, in Westphalia, who himself had been converted from Judaism to Christianity, speaking, in the history which he has given of his own conversion, of the praiseworthy conduct of an ecclesiastic, from whom, when a Jew, he had met with kindly treatment, goes on to say—"Let those who read my account imitate this illustrious example of love, and instead of despising and abhorring the Jews, as some are wont to do, let them, like genuine Christians, that is, followers of him who prayed for those that crucified him, go forth and meet them with brotherly love. For since, as our Saviour says, 'salvation cometh of the Jews' (John iv. 22), and as the apostle Paul testifies, 'through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles' (Romans xi. 11), it is a worthy return, and well pleasing to God, when Christians labour, so far as it lies in their power, for the salvation of those from whom they have received the author of their salvation, Jesus Christ. And if they are bound to extend their love even to those from whom they suffer wrong, how much more bound are they to show it to those through whom the greatest of all blessings has been derived to them? Let them, therefore, so far as they can, cherish

but in the later accounts are to be found differences. According to one of them, he met his death in Tunis; according to another, he first went to Tunis, and afterwards proceeded to Bugia. If we may believe one account, the merchants, after having uncovered him from the heap of stones, found a spark of life still remaining; they succeeded in fanning this slumbering spark to the point of reanimation, but he died on board ship, when in sight of his native land.

\* In the first crusade, the Jews in Rouen were, without distinction of sex or age, barred up in a church, and all who refused to receive baptism murdered. See Guibert. *Novigentens. de vita sua*, l. II. c. v.



the Jews and the Saracens, professional chairs should be established for the Arabic, Chaldee, and Hebrew languages in all cities where the papal court resided, and also at the universities of Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca. He now could not bear the thought of spending the close of his life at ease in his native land, to which he had returned for the last time. He desired nothing more than to offer up his life in the promulgation of the faith. Having spoken, in one of his works, of natural death, which he ascribed to the diminution of animal warmth, says he, "Thy servant would choose, if it please thee, not to die such a death: he would prefer that his life should end in the glow of love, as thou didst, in love, offer up thy life for us." \* "Thy servant," says he, "is ready to offer up himself, and to pour out his blood for thee. May it please thee, therefore, ere he comes to die, so to unite him to thyself that he, by meditation and love, may never be separated from thee." On the 14th of August, 1314, he crossed over, once more, to Africa. Proceeding to Bugia, he laboured there, at first, secretly, in the small circle of those whom, during his last visit to that place, he had won over to Christianity. He sought to confirm their faith, and to advance them still farther in Christian knowledge. In this way he might no doubt have continued to labour quietly for some time, but he could not resist the longing after martyrdom. He stood forth publicly, and declared that he was the same person whom they had once banished from the country, and exhorted the people, threatening them with divine judgments if they refused, to abjure Mohammedanism. He was fallen upon by the Saracens with the utmost fury. After having been severely handled, he was dragged out of the city, and, by the orders of the king, stoned to death. Merchants from Majorca obtained permission to extricate the body of their countryman from the heaps of stones under which it lay buried, and they conveyed it back, by ship, to their native land. The 30th of June, 1315, was the day of his martyrdom.†

\* The words of Raymund, in his work *De Contemplatione*, c. cxxx. *Distinct.* 27, f. 299: "Homines morientes præ senectute moriuntur per defectum caloris naturalis et per excessum frigoris et ideo tuus servus et tuus subditus, si tibi placeret, non vellet mori tali morte, imo vellet mori præ amoris ardore, quia tu voluisti mori tali morte."

† We cannot in this place go back to the reports of contemporaries,

We must now cast a glance at the relation of the dispersed Jews to the Christian church.

As it regards the Jews, who were scattered in great numbers in the West, it is to be remarked that the frequent oppressions, injuries, and persecutions which they had to suffer from the fanaticism and cupidity of so-called Christians, were not well calculated to open their minds to the preaching of the gospel; though, through fear, and to escape the sufferings or the death with which they were threatened, they might be induced to submit to the form of baptism, and to put on the profession of Christianity.\* Hermann, a monk of the twelfth century, from the monastery of Kappenberg, in Westphalia, who himself had been converted from Judaism to Christianity, speaking, in the history which he has given of his own conversion, of the praiseworthy conduct of an ecclesiastic, from whom, when a Jew, he had met with kindly treatment, goes on to say—"Let those who read my account imitate this illustrious example of love, and instead of despising and abhorring the Jews, as some are wont to do, let them, like genuine Christians, that is, followers of him who prayed for those that crucified him, go forth and meet them with brotherly love. For since, as our Saviour says, 'salvation cometh of the Jews' (John iv. 22), and as the apostle Paul testifies, 'through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles' (Romans xi. 11), it is a worthy return, and well pleasing to God, when Christians labour, so far as it lies in their power, for the salvation of those from whom they have received the author of their salvation, Jesus Christ. And if they are bound to extend their love even to those from whom they suffer wrong, how much more bound are they to show it to those through whom the greatest of all blessings has been derived to them? Let them, therefore, so far as they can, cherish

but in the later accounts are to be found differences. According to one of them, he met his death in Tunis; according to another, he first went to Tunis, and afterwards proceeded to Bugia. If we may believe one account, the merchants, after having uncovered him from the heap of stones, found a spark of life still remaining; they succeeded in fanning this slumbering spark to the point of reanimation, but he died on board ship, when in sight of his native land.

\* In the first crusade, the Jews in Rouen were, without distinction of sex or age, barred up in a church, and all who refused to receive baptism murdered. See Guibert. *Novigentens. de vita sua*, l. II. c. v.

their love for this people, helping them in their distresses, and setting them an example of all well-doing, so as to win by their example those whom they cannot persuade by their words, for example is really more effectual than words in producing conviction. Let them, also, send up fervent prayers to the Father of mercies, if peradventure God may one day give that people repentance to the acknowledging of the truth, 2 Timothy ii. 25." By means of the only business allowed to them, in their state of oppression, traffic and usury, they acquired great wealth; thereby sometimes attaining to great influence, even with monarchs; but this wealth also excited the cupidity of the great, and exposed them to be still more hated and persecuted.\* The fanaticism awakened by the crusades was often directed against the Jews, as the domestic enemies of the Cross; and hundreds, nay thousands, fell victims to such animosity. Rumours became current against the Jews, of the same description as have prevailed at all times against religious sects persecuted by popular hatred; as, for example, against the first Christians, who were charged with such crimes as flattered the credulous fanaticism of the populace. It was said that they stole Christian children for their passover festival, and, after having crucified them with all imaginable tortures, used their entrails for magical purposes.† If a boy, especially near the time of the feast of Passover, was missed by his friends, or if the corpse of a boy, concerning whose death nothing certain was known, happened to be found, suspicion lighted at once upon the Jews of the district where the accident had occurred. Men could easily discover what they were intent on finding—marks of the tortures which had been inflicted on the sufferers. It might doubtless happen, too, that enemies of the Jews, or those who gloated on their wealth, would disfigure the discovered bodies, in order to

\* The Jew introduced in Abelard's dialogue concerning the supreme good, inter philosophum, Judæum, et Christianum, observes, in drawing a lively picture of the wretched situation of the Jews: "*Unde nobis præcipue superest lucrum, ut alienigenis fœnerantes, hinc miseram sustentemus vitam, quod nos quidem maxime ipsis efficit invidiosos, qui se in hoc plurimum arbitrantur gravatos.*" See this tract, published by Prof. Rheinwald, p. 11.

† In the historical work of Matthew of Paris are to be found many stories relating to persecutions of the Jews, which had been provoked by the circulation of such fables.

lend the more plausibility to the accusations brought against Jews. Hence a boy so found might sometimes be honoured by the people as a martyr, and become the hero of a wonderful story.\* The most extravagant of such tales might find credence in the existing tone of public sentiment, and seem to be confirmed by an investigation begun with prejudice and conducted in a tumultuary manner. If, at the commencement of such movements, wealthy Jews betook themselves to flight, when they foresaw, as they must have foreseen, the disastrous issue to themselves, this passed for evidence of their guilt and of the truth of the rumours.† If twenty-five knights affirmed, on their oath, that the arrested Jews were guilty of the abominable crime, this sufficed to set the matter beyond all doubt, and to authorize the sentence of death.‡ Whoever interceded in behalf of the unfortunate victims, exposed himself by so doing to the popular hatred, which looked upon all such pity as suspicious. Thus, in the year 1256, pious Franciscans in England, who were not to be deterred by the force of the prevailing delusion, ventured to take the part of certain Jews, accused of some such abominable crime, that were languishing in prison, and they succeeded in procuring their release and saving their lives; but now these monks, who had acted in the spirit of Christian benevolence, were accused of having allowed themselves to be bribed by money.§ Thus they lost the good opinion of the lower class of people, who ever after refused to give them alms.||

These pious monks, and also the most influential men of the church, protested against such unchristian fanaticism. When the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux was rousing up the

\* See Matth. of Paris, at the year 1244. Ed. London, 1686, f. 567. In the case here in question, men were forced to allow, that five wounds could in nowise be made out in the corpse discovered.

† See l. c.

‡ See the account given by the above-cited historian, at the year 1256, f. 792.

§ The above historian, Matthew of Paris, otherwise a violent enemy of the mendicant monks, says, however, of this accusation: "Ut perhibet mundus, si mundo in tali casu credendum est." He himself only finds fault with the interposition of those Franciscans, since it is his opinion that those Jews had deserved death; but he honours in the Franciscans their compassion, and their charitable hope that these Jews might still, sometime or other, be converted.

|| A.D. 1256, f. 792.

spirit of the nations to embark in the second crusade, and issued for this purpose, in the year 1146, his letter to the Germans (East Franks), he at the same time warned them against the influence of those enthusiasts who called themselves messengers of the Lord, and strove to inflame the fanaticism of the people. He called upon the Germans to follow the direction of the apostle Paul, and not believe every spirit. He declaimed against the false zeal, without knowledge, which impelled them to murder the Jews, a people who ought not even to be banished from the country. He acknowledges their zeal for the cause of God; but requires that it should ever be accompanied with correct knowledge.\* “The Jews,” says he, “are scattered among all nations as living memorials of Christ’s passion, and of the divine judgment; but there is a promise of their future universal restoration, Rom. xi. 26. Even where no Jews are to be found, usurious Christians, if such men deserve to be called Christians, and not rather baptized Jews, are a worse kind of Jews. How could the promise concerning the future conversion of the Jews ever be fulfilled, if they were utterly exterminated?” The same reasons, we must allow, ought to have persuaded men rather to send missionaries to the Mohammedan nations than to attack them with the sword; and perhaps it may have occurred to Bernard himself, that this principle might be applied to the very crusade which he preached. To guard against any such application, he adds: “If the same thing could be expected also of other infidels, we ought certainly to bear with them, rather than to persecute them with the sword; but as they were the first to begin the work of violence, so it becomes those who, not without cause, have taken up the sword, to repel force with force. But at the same time it befits Christian piety, while it strikes down the proud, to spare the humble (*debellare superbos, parcere victis*).” Such representations were especially needed in this excitable period; but these words, written in the Latin language, could never reach the overheated popular mind. In these times there had started up, in the districts on the Rhine, a ferocious enthusiast, the monk Radulf (Rudolph), who, representing himself as a called

\* Ep. 363. *Andivimus et gaudemus, ut in vobis ferveat zelus Dei, sed oportet omnino temperamentum scientiæ non deesse.*

prophet of the Lord, preached, along with the Cross, death to the Jews. Thousands from Cologne, Mentz, Worms, Speiers, Strasburg, who had collected together for the crusades, turned their swords, in the first place, against the defenceless Jews, and a great deal of blood was shed.\* Rudolph would not be held back from obeying his imagined divine call by any authority of his ecclesiastical superior.† The archbishop Henry of Mentz, who could do nothing himself to counteract the influence of the enthusiast, applied for help to the French abbot, whose wonderful power over the minds of men was not unknown to him. Bernard, in his answer,‡ took very decided grounds against that monk. He found fault with his conduct in three respects: that he had taken it upon him to preach without being called, that he set at naught the authority of the bishops, and that he justified murder. This he called a doctrine of devils. "Does not the church," said he, "obtain a richer victory over the Jews, by daily bringing them over from their errors and converting them, than if by the sword she had destroyed them all at a blow?" He appeals to the prayer of the universal church for the conversion of the Jews, with which such proceedings stood directly at variance. But it was not till Bernard went himself to Germany, and used his personal influence, which was irresistible, that he could succeed in quelling the spirit of fanaticism. The people attached themselves to that enthusiast with so blind a devotion, that nothing but the veneration in which Bernard was held could restrain them from disturbances, when that leader was taken away from them. At Mentz, Bernard had a meeting with the monk Rudolph, and produced such an effect on him—which was indeed a marvel—by his expostu-

\* The sufferings of the Jews have been depicted, after the account of a German Jew, who, being then a lad of thirteen, was a witness of this bloody massacre of his countrymen and fellow-believers, in a Jewish chronicle, in the Hebrew language, by Jehoschua Ben Meir, of the sixteenth century. See Wilken's *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge*, dritter Theil, erste Abtheil, Beilage i. In this account, too, Bernard is honourably mentioned as deliverer of the Jews, without whose interposition not one in these districts would have escaped; and he says in his praise, he "took no ransom-money from the Jews, for he from his heart spoke good concerning Israel."

† See Otto Frising. hist. Frederic the First, l. II. c. 37.

‡ Ep. 365.

lations, that the man acknowledged he had done wrong, and promised for the future to confine himself obediently to his convent. The celebrated abbot Peter of Cluny, who was distinguished for a mildness of disposition springing out of the spirit of Christian love, even beyond Bernard himself,—who showed so liberal and so kindly a spirit in judging the different spiritual tendencies among Christians,—even he can only look upon the Jews as a race descended from the murderers of Christ, and filled with hatred to him. “If the Saracens, who in respect to the faith in Christ have so much in common with us, are still to be abominated,” he writes in his letter to king Louis the Seventh of France,\* “how much more should we detest the Jews, who blaspheme and ridicule Christ, and the whole Christian faith.” It is true, he declares himself opposed to the practice of massacring the Jews: “We should let them live, like the fratricide Cain, to their greater shame and torment,” says he; but he calls upon the king to deprive them of their wealth, which they had acquired unrighteously and at the expense of Christians,† and to devote the money justly extorted from them to the service of the holy cause which they hated.

In particular, it was a ruling principle with *the popes*, after the example of their predecessor, Gregory the Great, to protect the Jews in the rights which had been conceded to them. When the banished popes of the twelfth century returned to Rome, the Jews in their holiday garments went forth with the rest in procession, to meet them, bearing before them the thora; and Innocent the Second, on an occasion of this sort, prayed for them, that God would remove the veil from their hearts. Pope Innocent the Third, in the year 1199, published an ordinance, taking the Jews under his own protection against oppressions. “Much as the unbelief of the Jews is to be censured,” he wrote, “yet, inasmuch as the Christian faith is really confirmed by them, they must suffer no hard oppression from the faithful.” He appeals here to the example

\* Lib. iv. c. 36.

† Non enim de simplici agricultura, non de legali militia, non de quolibet honesto et utili officio horrea sua frugibus, cellaria vino, marsupia nummis, arcas auro sive argento cumulant, quantum de his, quæ Christiculis dolose subtrahunt, de his quæ furtim a furibus empta, vili pretio res carissimas comparant.

of his predecessors, which he followed: "No one should compel them by force to submit to baptism; but in case a Jew makes it known, that of his own free choice he has become a Christian, then no hindrances whatsoever shall be thrown in his way to prevent him from receiving baptism; for he who comes to the ordinance of Christian baptism through constraint, cannot be a true believer. No one should molest them in the possession of their property, or in the observance of their customs. In the celebration of their festivals they should not be disturbed by tumultuary proceedings." \* This pope was at much pains to provide for the maintenance of Jews who embraced Christianity, and who by so doing lost the means of living which they before enjoyed.† It might doubtless happen, however, that the pope, when applied to for relief by converted Jews from distant parts, would sometimes be deceived by false reports, stories of miracles by which these persons pretended to have been converted; still he did not lend implicit confidence to such reports, but caused more exact inquiries to be made respecting their truth in the countries where such events were said to have occurred.‡

When the Jews in France, in the year 1236, saw themselves abandoned to the ferocious cruelty of the crusaders, they, too, applied for help to the pope, then Gregory the Ninth. He in consequence sent a letter to France, expressing in the most emphatic language his indignation at such barbarity. The crusaders, instead of arming themselves, body and soul, for a war which was to be carried on in the name of the Lord, instead of manifesting in their behaviour so much the more fear of God, and love to God, as they were to fight in the cause

\* Lib. II. ep. 302.

† E. g. l. II. ep. 234. *Attenta est sollicitudine providendum, ne inter alios Christi fideles inedia deprimantur, cum plerique horum pro indigentia necessarium rerum post receptum baptismum in confusionem non modicam inducantur, ita ut plerumque faciente illorum avaritia, qui cum ipsi abundant, Christum pauperem respicere dedignantur, retro cogantur abire.*

‡ Like that extravagant tale of a Jew, who found in a chest of gold, in which a stolen consecrated host had been deposited, the gold pieces converted into holy wafers. The pope directed the bishop in the place where this Jew lived, at the same time that he recommended him and his family to his care, to make a full and careful examination with regard to the truth of that story, and return him a faithful report. Innocent. I. XIV. ep. 84.



of the Lord, had executed godless counsels against the Jews ; but, in so doing, they had not considered that Christians must derive the evidences of their faith from the archives of the Jews, and that the Lord would not reject his people for ever, but a remnant of them should be saved. Not considering this, they had acted as if they meant to exterminate them from the earth, and with unheard of cruelty had butchered two thousand and five hundred persons of all ages and sexes. And in extenuation of this atrocious crime they affirmed they had done so, and threatened to do worse, because the Jews would not be baptized. “ They did not consider,” writes the pope, “ that while Christ excludes no nation and no race from the salvation which he came to bring to all mankind ; still, as everything depends on the inward operation of divine grace, as the Lord has mercy on whom he will have mercy, no man should be forced to receive baptism ; for as man fell by his own free will, yielding to the temptation to sin, so with his own free will he must follow the call of divine grace, in order to be recovered from his fall.” \* Pope Innocent the Fourth, to whom the Jews of Germany complained, on account of the oppressions and persecutions which they had to suffer from secular and spiritual lords, issued a brief, in the year 1248, for their protection. In this brief he declared the story about the Christian boy murdered for the celebration of the Jewish passover a pure fiction, invented solely for the purpose of hiding cupidity and cruelty, and of getting Jews condemned without the formality of a trial. Wherever a dead body happened to be found, it was maliciously made use of as a means of criminating the Jews.†

Again, the Jews would unavoidably be shocked and repelled by those peculiarities in the shaping of the church at this time, which, though grounded in an original Christian feeling, yet in their extravagance bordered upon the pagan ; as, for example,

\* See Raynaldi *Annales* ad A. 1236, s. 48.

† *Scriptura divina inter alia mandata legis dicente : non occides, ac prohibente illos in sollemnitate paschali quicquam morticinium contingere, falsa imponunt iisdem, quod in ipsa sollemnitate se corde pueri communicant interfecti, credendo id ipsam legem præcipere, cum sit legi contrarium manifeste, ac eis malitiose objiciunt hominis cadaver mortui, si contigerit illud alicubi reperiri. Et per hoc et alia quamplurima figmenta sævientes in ipsis eos super his non accusatos, nec convictos spoliant contra Deum et justitiam omnibus suis, etc.* Raynaldi *Annales* ad A. 1248, s. 84.

the worship of saints and images. Pious ecclesiastics and monks were always ready to enter into controversial discussions with Jews, in the hope of convincing them by arguments; although laymen, in the zeal for their religious creed, were dissatisfied with a mode of procedure which allowed the Jews so peacefully to state all their objections to the Christian faith, and required others so patiently to listen to them. They, on the contrary, were for deciding the matter at once, and punishing the unbelief of the Jews with the sword.\* In such disputes, the Jews levelled their objections not only against the fundamental position of the Christian system in itself considered, which to the fleshly Jewish mode of thought clinging to the letter of the Old Testament, and to sensual expectations, must at all times be alike offensive; but also against those excrescent growths so foreign to primitive Christianity. And although Christian theologians, in the confidence and in the light of Christian faith, could say many excellent things about the relation of the Old and New Testaments, and of their different comparative positions, still, they were no match for the Jews in the interpretation of the Old Testament; and their arbitrary allegorizing explications could not remove any of the difficulties by which the Jews were stumbled in comparing the

\* Joinville narrates, in the *Memoirs of Louis the Ninth*: Once a great controversial discussion started up in the monastery of Cluny, between the ecclesiastics and Jews, when an old knight rose up and demanded that the most distinguished among the ecclesiastics and the most learned among the Jews should come forward. Then he asked the Jew, whether he believed that Christ was born of a virgin? When the Jew replied in the negative, said the knight to him, You behave, then, very foolishly and presumptuously, in daring to come into a house consecrated to Mary—the convent. He dealt the Jew so violent a blow, that he sunk to the ground, and the rest fled for their lives. The abbot of Cluny now said to the knight: “Vous avez fait folie, de ce que vous avez ainsi frappé.” The knight, however, would not acknowledge this, but rejoined: “Vous avez fait encore plus grande folie, d’avoir ainsi assemblé les Juifs et souffert telles disputations d’erreurs;” for many good Christians had thereby been misled into infidelity. So thought, too, king Louis the Ninth of France. None but learned theologians should dispute with the Jews; nor should the laity ever listen to such blasphemies, but punish them at once with the sword. “Que nul, si n’est grand clerc et théologien parfait, ne doit disputer aux Juifs. Mais doit l’homme lay, quant il oy mesdire la foi Chrétienne, défendre la chose non pas seulement des paroles, mais à bonne épée tranchante et en frapper les mesdisans à travers du corps, tant qu’elle y pourra entrer.”

Old Testament with the New, nor lead them away from the letter to the spirit. A narrow slavery to the letter, and an arbitrary spiritualization, here stood confronted.\* We hear a Jew, for example, appealing to the eternal validity of the law. "A curse is pronounced upon every man that observes not the whole law," says he; "What right or authority have you Christians to make here an arbitrary distinction, to explain that some things are to be observed while others are done away with? How is this to be reconciled with the immutability of God's word?" He finds in the Old Testament the prediction of a Messiah, but nothing concerning a God-man. The doctrine concerning such a being appeared to him a disparagement of God's glory. The promises relating to the times of the Messiah seem to him not yet fulfilled. "If it be true that the Messiah is already come, how are we to reconcile it with the fact that nowhere, except among the poor people of the Jews, is it said, 'Come, let us go up to the house of the God of Jacob?' Some of you say, let us go to the house of Peter; others, let us go to the house of Martin. Where is it that swords are turned into pruning-hooks? Smiths enough can hardly be found to convert steel into weapons of war. One nation oppresses, cuts in pieces another; and every boy is trained up to the use of weapons." The Christian theologian, abbot Gislebert, replies to the last objection: "Neither to Peter nor Paul do we build a house; but in honour and in memory of Peter or Paul we build a house to God. Nor can any bishop, in dedicating a church, say, 'To thee, Peter or Paul, we dedicate this house, or this altar;' but only, 'To thee, O God, we dedicate this house, or this altar, for the glory of God.'" Next, he insists on it that those promises concerning the times of the Messiah have been spiritually fulfilled. "The law pronounces sentence of condemnation on every man who kills, or rather, as Christ has added, on every man who is angry with his brother; he, then, who is transported with the passions of anger and hatred, cannot lawfully use the sword and lance. Far easier is it to turn the sword into a

\* In the *Disputatio Judæi cum Christiano de fide Christiana* by the abbot Gislebert (Gilbert) of Westminster, in the beginning of the twelfth century, which is founded on a dispute actually held with a Jew, in *Anselmi Cant. opp. ed. Gerberon*, f. 512.

ploughshare, the spear into a pruning-hook, than to turn from a proud man into a humble one, from a freeman to a servant ; to give up wife, children, house and court, arms, all earthly goods, and very self. This, however, is a thing that you may often see done ; for many who once lived in the world, proud and mighty men, constantly buckled for war, greedy after other men's possessions, have for God's sake renounced all worldly glory, go in voluntary poverty on pilgrimages to different holy places, seek the intercession of the saints, or immure themselves in a convent. And, in such a community of the servants of God, is fulfilled that which God promised by the prophets concerning the peaceful living together of the lion and the lamb, &c. ; for, to the shepherd of such a flock obedience is alike paid by high and low, by the mighty and the powerful, the strong and the weak."

An example, showing how the power of Christianity was still present, even amid the foreign rubbish with which it was encumbered, and could make itself be felt in the minds of the Jews, is seen in the remarkable case of Hermann, afterwards a Premonstratensian monk, whose conversion, which he has given an account of himself,\* was brought about by a singular train of providential occurrences.

He was born at Cologne, and strictly educated as a Jew. When a young man he made a journey to Mentz, on commercial business. It happened at the same time that Egbert, bishop of Münster,† who had himself at some earlier period been dean of the cathedral at Cologne, was there with the emperor's court-camp. Being in want of money, the bishop negotiated a loan with this Jew ; but the latter took no security from him, which was quite contrary to the practice of his people, who were accustomed to require a pledge to the amount of double the sum lent. When he returned home, his friends reproached him for such folly, and urged him to seek another interview with the bishop. Fearing, however, the influence of the Christians on the young man, they commissioned an old Jew, Baruch, to act as his overseer. Thus he travelled back to Münster ; and here, as the bishop could not immediately refund the money, he was obliged to tarry

\* Published by Carpzov, after Raymund Martini's *Pugio fidei*.

† Bishop of Münster from 1127 to 1132.

five months. The young man, having no particular business on his hands, could not resist the curiosity he felt to visit the churches, which he had hitherto detested as temples of idols. He here heard the bishop preach. Many things in the discourse attracted him, and he repeated his visits. Thus he received his first Christian impressions. Christians, observing how attentively he listened, asked him, how he liked what he heard: he replied, "Many things pleased me, others not." They spoke to him kindly: "Our Jesus," said they, "is full of compassion, and, as he himself declares, 'No man that cometh unto me shall be cast out.'" They held up to him the example of the apostle Paul, who from a violent persecutor of Christianity became a zealous preacher of it; but the Jew saw pictures of Christ in the churches, and as this appeared to him like idolatry, he was filled with abhorrence. Thus different impressions struggled together in his soul. It so happened, that the universally revered abbot Rupert of Deutz (Rupertus Tuitiensis, the author of a tract against the Jews) came to Münster, and to him Hermann ventured to disclose his doubts. The abbot received him in a friendly manner, and sought to convince him that the Christians were very far from paying an idolatrous worship to images. "Images," said he, "are designed solely to supply the place of Scripture for the rude people."

The bishop employed as the steward of his house a pious ecclesiastic named Richmar, a man of strictly ascetic habits, who by his kindly manners had won his way to the young man's heart. Once the bishop sent a choice dish from his own table to this churchman; but he immediately gave it to the young Hermann, who sat by his side, while he himself took nothing but bread and water. This made a great impression on the youth. As this pious man, in many conversations with Hermann, had sought in vain to convince him of the truth of Christianity, he finally conceived the hope that by the evidence of some miracle, a judgment of God, the ordeal of the red-hot iron, he might be able to conquer the unbelief of the sign-seeking Jew; but the bishop, his superior in Christian knowledge and wisdom, would allow of no such experiment. Said he to his steward, "True, thy zeal is praiseworthy, but it is not accompanied with knowledge. We should not presume to tempt God in this way; but we should pray to him, that

he, who wills that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, would be pleased, in his own time and way, by his grace to break the fetters of unbelief in which this young man is bound captive, and set him free; but it was not proper to require God to work a miracle for this purpose, nor even to be particularly anxious that he would; since it was perfectly easy for the Almighty, even without a miracle, by the secret operation of his grace, to convert whomsoever he pleased; and since, too, the outward miracle would be unavailing unless he wrought after an invisible manner by his grace in the heart of the man. Many had been converted without miracles; multitudes had remained unbelievers even after miracles had been wrought before their eyes. The faith induced by miracles had little or no merit in the sight of God; but the faith which came from a simple pious sense had the greatest," which he sought to prove by examples from gospel history, and from the words of Christ himself.

When Hermann afterwards had an opportunity of visiting the newly founded Premonstratensian convent at Kappenberg in Westphalia, and here saw men of the highest and lowest ranks unite together in practising the same self-denials, it appeared to him a very strange sight; as yet he knew not what to make of it. Thus he was tossed one way and another by his feelings, till his mind became completely unsettled. He prayed to God, with warm tears, that if the Christian faith came from him, he would, either by inward inspiration or by vision, or—which then appeared to him the most effective means—by some visible miraculous sign, convince him of it. He who was said to have led a Paul, even when he proudly resisted, to the faith, would assuredly, if this were true, hear him, so humble a suppliant!

After his return home he spent three days, strictly fasting, in prayer to the Almighty, and waiting in expectation of a vision for the clearing up of his doubts; when, exhausted by fasting and by his inward conflicts, he retired to rest; but the vision which he sought was not vouchsafed to him. He applied to book-learned churchmen, and disputed with them; yet to all the arguments which they could bring his doubts were invincible, although many of the remarks which fell from them left a sting behind in his heart.

Meanwhile the Jews had long eyed him with suspicion;

and they employed every means to deter him from embracing Christianity. They prevailed upon him to marry, and by the wedding-feast and the dissipations connected with his new relation, he was, in fact, diverted for a while from the subject which had so long occupied and tormented him; but after passing three months in a state of dreamy torpor, his old inward conflicts returned again. He once more sought the society of Christian theologians, with whom he had many disputes. Once, after he had long contended with one of these theologians in an assembly of clergymen, said one of the number to the theologian who had sought in vain to convince him: "Why spend your strength to no purpose? Surely you know that, as the apostle Paul declares, even to this day, when to the Jews Moses is read, a covering hangs before their hearts." This remark again made a deep impression on Hermann's mind. "Is my heart," thought he, "really prevented by such a covering from penetrating to the spirit of the Old Testament?" Again, therefore, he had recourse to prayer, and with many tears besought the Almighty that, if this were so, he would himself remove the covering from his heart, that he might with open eyes behold the clear light of truth; and recollecting what Christians had said to him about the power of intercessions, he commended himself to the prayers of two nuns who stood in high veneration among all the Christians in Cologne. They promised him that they would not cease praying until the comfort of divine grace should be given to him. Becoming soon afterwards more clear in his views and feelings, he believed himself to be especially indebted for this change to the intercessions of these two pious nuns.\* He continued diligently to attend on the preached word, putting aside everything else, and making the search after truth the great object of his life. His inquiries and prayers conducted him at length to a settled conviction. He submitted to baptism, entered the monastery of Kappenberg, which on his first visit had made so singular an impression on his mind, where he studied the Latin language, and was consecrated a priest.

\* He says: "Ecce me, quem ad fidem Christi nec reddita mihi a multis de ea ratio, nec magnorum potuit clericorum convertere disputatio, devota simplicium feminarum oratio attraxit."

## SECTION SECOND.

## HISTORY OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

## I. POPES AND PAPACY.

WE commence this period in the history of the papacy, with a crisis of world-historical interest. The great question was now up, to be answered by the course of events: Whether the system of the church theocracy, the spiritual universal monarchy, should come off victorious in the contest with a rude secular power, or should be laid prostrate under its feet? The key to the right understanding of this new epoch is furnished us by the epoch with which the preceding period closed. One continuous thread of historical evolution, a closely connected series of causes and effects, proceeds onward from the last times of the preceding period into the beginning of the present. The corruption of the church, threatening its utter secularization, had now reached its highest pitch; and that very circumstance had called forth a reformatory reaction on the part of the church. Such a reaction could, however, under the existing conditions, only proceed from the side of this church theocracy; since those who were most zealous against the abuses that had crept in, were governed by this spiritual tendency. The *man* of this party, he who was in fact the guiding and animating soul of the reformatory reaction in the last times of the preceding period, was that *Hildebrand* who now, as pope Gregory the Seventh, had become in name, as he had long been secretly in fact, the ruling head of the Western church. As this world-historical personage was, from the first, the object of extravagant veneration with some, and of equally extravagant hatred with others, so the same contrariety of opinion with regard to him continued to prevail in the succeeding centuries.

Gregory was certainly inspired with some higher motive



than selfish ambition, a selfish love of domination. One predominating *idea* inspired him; and to this he sacrificed all other interests, the idea of the independence of the church, and of the control to be exercised by her over all other human relations, the idea of a religious, moral dominion over the world, to be administered by the papacy. This was not, indeed, the purely Christian idea of dominion over the world, but a recasting of it under an Old Testament form altogether foreign to Christianity; and that, too, not without some mixture of the idea of Rome's ancient imperial sovereignty. This idea, however, was no invention of Gregory's; but having sprung, as we have shown, out of the course of development which the church had taken, it had acquired, by the reaction in favour of reform since the time of Leo the Ninth, a new force over the minds of the better-disposed. There were men, extremely prejudiced, it is true, yet animated by a warm zeal for the welfare of the church and against the deep-rooted abuses of the times, who expected, from this imperial sovereignty of the church, wielded by the popes, the correction of all evils. To them the church appeared as the representative of the divine jurisdiction, by which all social relations were to be regulated, all abuses to be removed. The church must by her equitable decisions prevent wars; or, if she could not effect this, bestow communion and absolution on the party in the right, while she excluded the one in the wrong from the fellowship of the church, and refused it the privilege of ecclesiastical burial to the dead.\*

\* This idea is unfolded by that rigid censor of the clergy, a contemporary of Bernard of Clairvaux, the sincerely pious provost Gerhoh (Geroh) of Reichersberg in Bavaria, particularly in his commentary on the 64th Psalm, or his tract *De corrupto ecclesiæ statu*, where he sets it over against the then corrupt condition of the church, which should be restored and improved according to this standard, published by Baluz in the fifth volume of his *Miscellanea*. The same tract of Geroh is to be found abbreviated in his commentary on the Psalms; an important work on account of the information it gives us of the condition of the church in these times, published by Pez in the *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, t. v. He looks upon it as a strange and unheard of thing, that both the contending parties in a war should receive the communion, when in truth justice could only be on one side, and the tribunal of the church therefore could decide in favour of but one party. *In omni militum vel civium guerra et discordia vel pars altera justa et altera injusta, vel utraque invenitur injusta, cujus rei veritatem patefacere deberet sacerdotalis doctrina, sine cujus censura nulla bella sunt movenda. Sic ergo*

, The monk Hildebrand had certainly been seized with this idea, and active in endeavouring to realize it, before he could have entertained any thought of being elevated himself to the papal throne. Educated as a monk at Rome, it was natural that, in a man of his serious disposition, and situated as he was, the idea of such a jurisdiction to be exercised by the church should be awakened in the fullest force.\* Well might his disgust at the prevailing corruption in Rome and Italy have moved Hildebrand the monk to retreat with his friend, the deposed pope Gregory the Sixth, to the countries beyond the Alps; and well might he again, in the hope of being able, by virtue of his connection with the popes, to counteract this corruption, have resolved to return back to Rome, as he says in a remarkable letter to his friend, the abbot Hugo of Cluny:† “Were it not that I hoped to attain to a yet better life, and to serve the cause of the church, nothing would induce me to stay here in Rome, where, not by my own choice, as God is my witness, I have already been compelled to live through a period of twenty

manifestata justitia pars justa sacerdotalibus tubis animanda et etiam communione dominici corporis ante bellum et ad bellum roboranda est, quia panis iste cor hominis confirmat, quando pro defensione justitiæ vel ecclesiæ aliquis ad pugnam se præparat, cui pars iniqua resistens et pacto justæ pacis acquiescere nolens anathematizanda et etiam negata sibi sepultura christiana humilianda est. But how is it at present, when—one prince or one people waging an unjust war against another—the Lord’s body is given to both parties without examination of the merits of the case? Tanquam divisus sit Christus et possit esse in tunc contrariis partibus. How easily, he exclaims, by the united agreement of the bishops in one judgment, could the madness of those princes and knights who make confusion in the Roman empire, and spread devastation through the church, be curbed and restrained? If he, then, who has been placed over the whole, in order to preserve unity and to strengthen his brethren, Luke xxii. 32, should in every just judgment anticipate the bishops by a circular letter addressed to them—what monarch would dare to set himself up in opposition to such a decision? Cum sit velut alter Jeremias, constitutus non solum super ecclesias, sed etiam super regna, ut evellat et destruat, ædificet et plantet. See l. c. in Pez. f. 1183.

\* Where he speaks of his obligations to the apostle Peter, in a letter to king William of England, l. VII. ep. 23. Quia S. Petrus a puero me in domo sua dulciter nutrierat.

† L. c. l. II. ep. 49. Gregory himself says to the Romans: “Vos seitis, quod ad sacros ordines non libenter accessi, sed magis invitatus cum Domino Leone Papa ad vestram specialem ecclesiam rediî, in qua utenique vobis servivi.” Eccard, Scriptores rer. Germ. ep. 150.

years." "God," he remarks, "had brought him back to Rome against his will, and bound him there with his own fetters."\* In passing judgment on this great man, we should not try him by the standard of a pure evangelical knowledge, to which he could not possibly have attained by his course of training. Seized and carried away by the above-mentioned dominant idea, he interpreted by that the testimonies of the Bible and of History, and these would all seem to confirm the same; but he who surrenders himself so entirely to one idea, seen in one aspect, as to let it swallow up all other human interests, and all the feelings implanted in man's nature, must become a slave to it. He who allows the zeal for such an idea to usurp the place of a zeal for truth and justice, will soon have formed within himself a *particular conscience* also, which may sanction many things, tending to the advantage of his party-bent, that a true conscience and the divine law would condemn. He who believes himself the vicegerent of the divine will in the government of mankind, will easily be misled, to set up *his own* will in place of the divine, and then think himself entitled to take many liberties for the realization of that divine will. With his fanatical self-devotion to this one tendency, this energetic man united a calculating prudence not always coupled with truth; as we have had occasion to see already in his treatment of that upright follower of the interests of truth alone, Berengarius.

It is certain that Hildebrand's power in Rome had become so great, he had so considerable a party in his favour, that no intrigues were needed on his part to secure for him the papal dignity, an eminence which he might have reached sooner, perhaps, if he had desired it; for, as it was justly remarked of him in his own time, "after having prepared everything to suit his wishes, he stepped into the papal chair the moment he was ready."† The less to be credited, therefore, are the ac-

\* Si non sperarem ad meliorem vitam et utilitatem sanctæ ecclesiæ venire, nullo modo Romæ, in qua coactus, Deo teste, jam a viginti annis inhabitavi, remanerem; and afterwards, eum, qui me suis alligavit vinculis et Romam invitum reduxit.

† Præparatis ex sententia, quæ voluit, Cathedram quando voluit ascendit. So speak Gregory's opponents in the noticeable tract of Dieteric, bishop of Verdun, A.D. 1080, in Martene et Durand thesaur. nov. anecdotorum, T. V. f. 217. Cited in the same place are opposite views respecting Gregory's previous conduct, and his election to the papacy. One party

cusations which his opponents, even in published writings, had the boldness to bring against him.\* Still, some occasion was given for these accusations by the mode in which Gregory's election was conducted.

The death of pope Alexander was not followed by the disturbances so common on such occasions among the Roman people, who were accustomed to manifest very soon their predilection for this or that cardinal whom they chose to have pope. The college of cardinals, therefore, supposed they had no interruption to fear in their preparatory proceedings to the choice of a new pope, and they ordered that, before they met to make arrangements for the new election, prayers for illumination and guidance should be addressed to the Almighty in connection with processions and fasting during three days.† Yet at the burial of Alexander, the people loudly demanded that Hildebrand should be made pope.‡ Although the legal form, therefore, was *afterwards* observed, and a protocol adopted, certifying to Hildebrand's election, yet it is manifest that the choice had already been made. Gregory declares, in

says of him : *Decedentibus patribus saepe electum et accitum, semper quidem animi, aliquando etiam corporis fuga dignitatis locum declinasse*; at length he recognised in the universal voice the will of God. Others, Gregory's ferocious enemies, say many things hardly consistent with one another, and even self-contradictory, respecting the manner in which he attained to the papal throne. The truth perhaps is contained in their single remark, "*quando voluit*;" but this circumstance is easily to be accounted for by his previous activity, and makes all the other explanations of his papal election superfluous.

\* Cardinal Beuno, in his invective against Gregory, says, that when pope Alexander, sub miserabili jugo Hildebrandi, died one evening, Hildebrand was placed by his partisans at once, and without the concurrence of the clergy and the community, upon the papal throne, because it was feared that, if there were any delay, some other person would be elected; not one of the cardinals subscribed to it. (All which, however, is refuted by the published protocol certifying his election.) To the abbot of Monte Cassino, who arrived after the election was over, Gregory is said to have remarked : "*Frater, nimium tardasti*," to which the abbot replied : "*Et tu, Hildebrande, nimium festinasti, qui nondum sepulto domino tuo papa, sedem apostolicam contra canones usurpasti.*"

† As Gregory himself declares, in the letters in which he made known his election.

‡ He himself says : "*Subito ortus est magnus tumultus populi et fremitus, et in me quasi vesani insurrexerunt, nil dicendi, nil consulendi facultatis aut spatii relinquentes.*"

the letters issued soon after his election, and later, that he had been elevated to the papal dignity against his will, and not without strenuous opposition on his part. Still, the sincerity of such professions is always more or less liable to suspicion. Even though it was Gregory's determination, after he had thus far ruled by means of others, now to take the government of the church into his own hands, yet we may at all events believe that he must have foreseen the difficult contests into which he would be thrown; and that, undertaking to exercise such a trust, would turn out to him no idle affair; and amid the multiplied troubles and vexations of his later reign, he might well sigh after the tranquil seclusion of the monastic life. In a letter to duke Gottfried, who had congratulated him on his election,\* he complains of the secret cares and anxieties which oppressed him. "Nearly the whole world is lying in such wickedness, that all, and the bishops in particular, seem emulous to destroy rather than to defend or to adorn the church. Striving only after gain and honour, they stand opposed to everything which serves to promote religion and the cause of God." In the second year of his reign, he presented a picture of his troubles and conflicts, in a letter, to his intimate friend, the abbot Hugo of Cluny.† "Often have I prayed God, either to release me from the present life, or through me to benefit our common mother; yet he has not delivered me from my great sufferings; nor has my life, as I wished, profited the mother with whom he has connected me." He then describes the lamentable condition of the church: "The Oriental church fallen from the faith, and attacked from without, by the infidels. Casting your eye over the West, South, or North, you find scarcely anywhere bishops who have obtained their office regularly, or whose life and conversation correspond to its requirements, and who are actuated in the discharge of their duties by the love of Christ and not by worldly ambition: ‡ nowhere, princes who prefer God's honour to their own, and justice before gain." "The men among whom he lived," he said, "Romans, Longobards, Normans, were, as he often told them, worse than Jews and pagans."

\* Ep. 9.

† Lib. II. ep. 49.

‡ Vix legales episcopos introitu et vita, qui Christianum populum Christi amore et non seculari ambitione, regant.

- “And when I look at myself,” he adds, “I find myself oppressed by such a burden of sin, that no other hope of salvation is left me but in the mercy of Christ alone.” And, indeed it is a true picture which Gregory here draws of his times.

Before we follow out the acts of Gregory in detail, let us cast a glance at the principles of his conduct generally, as they are exhibited to us in his letters. Those persons assuredly mistake him, who are willing to recognize nothing else, as his governing principle, than prudence. Though it is, indeed, true, that prudence formed one of his most distinguishing characteristics; yet, believing as he did, that he acted in virtue of a trust committed to him by God, it was a higher confidence which sustained and kept him erect through all his conflicts. It was in perfect consistency with those views which he had derived from the Scriptures of the Old Testament, respecting the theocracy, that he should so readily allow himself to be guided by supernatural signs, and judgments of God. He placed great reliance on his intimate connections with St. Peter and the Virgin Mary.\* Among his confidential agents he had a monk, who boasted of a peculiar intimacy with the Virgin Mary; and to this person he applied, in all doubtful cases, bidding him seek, with prayer and fasting, for some special revelation, by vision, respecting the matter in question.† To his friend the Margravine Mathilda, who honoured and loved him as a spiritual father, he earnestly re-

\* By this pope, a special office of devotion, addressed to the Virgin Mary, was introduced into the monasteries. See the above-mentioned work of Geroch, on the Psalms, l. c. fol. 794: “Et in cœnobiis canticum novum celebratur, cum a tempore Gregorii septi cursus Beatæ Mariæ frequentatur.” Also, in the above-cited letter of Dieteric of Verdun, mention is made of divine visions which were attributed to Gregory; and it is said of him, “Juxta quod boni et fide digni homines attestantur, eum non parvam in oculis Dei familiaritatis gratiam assecutum esse.”

† A writer of this time, the abbot Haymo, relates in his life of William, abbot of Firschau, that Gregory, being uncertain which of two candidates proposed to him should be selected for a bishopric, directed a monk to pray that it might be revealed to him, by the mediation of the Virgin Mary, which would be the best choice. See his life, s. 22, in Mabillon's *Acta Sanct.* O. B. T. VI. p. ii. f. 732. As this anecdote wholly agrees with what we have already quoted, from the mouth of Berengar, we are the less warranted to entertain any doubt respecting this characteristic trait in the life of Gregory.

commended,\* as a means of defence against the princes of the world, that she should frequently partake of the Holy supper, and commit herself to the special protection of the Virgin Mary. The peculiar bent of his own devotion, here expresses itself: "I, myself," he writes, "have expressly commended thee to her, and will not cease commending thee to her till we shall behold her, as we long to do—she, whom heaven and earth cease not to praise, though they cannot do it as she deserves. But of this be firmly persuaded, that as she is exalted, good, and holy above every mother, so too, and in the same proportion, is she more gracious and gentle towards converted sinful men and women. Put away, then, the disposition to sin, pour out thy tears before her, prostrating thyself before her with an humble and contrite heart; and I promise it with certainty, thou shalt find, by experience, how much more full of love and kindness she will be to thee than thine own mother according to the flesh."†

Gregory decidedly avows the principle, that God had conferred on Peter and his successors, not only the guidance of the whole church in respect to spiritual affairs, but also a moral superintendence over all nations. To the spiritual, he maintains, everything else should be subordinated. All worldly interests are vastly inferior to the spiritual. How, then, should not the juridical authority of the pope extend over them? ‡ We find Gregory entertaining an idea, which is expressed also in other writings of this party, according to which, the priestly

\* Lib. I. ep. 47.

† Cui te principaliter commisi et committo et nunquam committere, quousque illam videamus, ut cupimus, omittam, quid tibi dicam, quam cælum et terra laudare, licet ut meretur nequeant, non cessant? Hoc tamen procul dubio teneas, quia quanto altior et melior ac sanctior est omni matre, tanto clementior et dulcior circa conversos peccatores et peccatrices. Pone itaque finem in voluntate peccandi et prostrata coram illa ex corde contrito et humiliato lacrimas effunde. Invenies illam, indubitanter promitto, promptiorem carnali matre ac mitiorem in tui dilectione.

‡ Lib. I. ep. 63. Petrus apostolus, quem Dominus Jesus Christus rex gloriæ principem super regna mundi constituit. Lib. VII. ep. 6, concerning Peter: Cui omnes principatus et potestates orbis terrarum subjiciens (Deus) jus ligandi atque solvendi in cælo et in terra tradidit. In a letter to king William of England, in which the pope certainly was inclined to lower rather than to elevate his tone: Ut cura et dispensatione apostolicæ dignitatis post Deum gubernetur regia.

authority would appear to be the only one truly ordained of God,—the authority by which everything was finally to be brought back into the right train; for the authority of princes grew originally out of sinful self-will, the primitive equality of mankind having been broken up by the violence of those who, by rapine, murder, and every other species of atrocity, elevated themselves above their equals; \*—a view which might be confirmed, in the minds of some, on contemplating the then rude condition of civil society. Yet, in other places, when not pushed by opposition to this extreme, he recognizes the kingly authority as also ordained of God; only maintaining, that it should confine itself within its own proper limits, remaining subordinate to the papal power, which is sovereign over all. He says that the two authorities stand related to each other as sun and moon, and compares them with the two eyes of the body. †

We see by single examples how welcome it would have been to the pope if all monarchs had been disposed to receive their kingdoms as fiefs of the apostle Peter. Thus he would have converted the sovereignty of Peter into an altogether secular empire; and he looked upon it as an insult to that sovereignty that a king of Hungary, who ought to have regarded himself as a king dependent on St. Peter, should place himself in a relation of dependence on the German empire. He considered it deserving of reproach, that he should be willing to undergo the shame of making himself a dependent

\* In the famous letter to bishop Hermann of Mentz, l. VIII. ep. 21 : *Quis nesciat reges et duces ab iis habuisse principium, qui Deum ignorantes, superbia, rapinis, perfidia, homicidiis, postremo universis pæne sceleribus, mundi principe diabolo videlicet agitante, super pares, scilicet homines, dominari cæca cupiditate et intolerabili præsumptione affectaverunt?*

† Lib. I. ep. 19. *Nam sicut duobus oculis humanum corpus temporali lumine regitur, ita his duabus dignitatibus in pura religione concordantibus corpus ecclesiæ spirituali lumine regi et illuminari probatur.* Lib. VII. ep. 25 to king William of England : *Sicut ad mundi pulchritudinem oculis carnis diversis temporibus representandam solem et lunam omnibus aliis eminentiora disposuit luminaria, sic ne creatura, quam sui benignitas ad imaginem suam in hoc mundo creaverat, in errorem et mortifera traheretur pericula, providit in apostolica et regia dignitate, per diversa regeretur officia. Qua tamen majoritatis et minoritatis distantia religio sic se movet Christiana, ut cura et dispensatione apostolicæ dignitatis post Deum gubernetur regia.*



*regulus* on German kings, rather than to enjoy the honour of being dependent alone on the first of the apostles.\* And to this he referred the promise of Christ regarding the Rock, against which the powers of hell should never prevail; that whoever would wrest his kingdom out of this relation of dependence to the church of Rome, must experience, by the loss of his inherited kingdom, the punishment due to his *sacrilege*, in his own person. So Spain was held to have been from the earliest times a fief of the Romish Church.† From the Romish church it was maintained, indeed, that *all other spiritual* authority was derived, and all ecclesiastical authorities should appear as organs of the pope; yet among these authorities there should subsist a regular subordination, and all, through a certain series of gradations, return back to the one common head.‡ Gregory professed, it is true, in continuing the contest begun by the popes at the close of the preceding period, that he acted as defender of the ancient ecclesiastical laws; yet, at the same time also, he expressly declared, that it stood in his power to enact new laws against new abuses, which, when enacted, imposed an obligation of universal obedience.§ As he frequently made use of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which, by reason of his peculiar mode of apprehending the theocracy, would be particularly acceptable to him, so his favourite motto, whenever he spoke of maintaining, in spite of all opposition, the validity of the church laws, and of punishing abuses, was, “Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood,” Jeremiah xlviii. 10.||

\* Lib. II. ep. 70, to king Seusa of Hungary: *Ubi contempto nobili dominio Petri, apostolorum principis, rex subdidit se Teutonico regi, et reguli nomen obtinuit, et ita si quid in obtinendo regno juris prius habuit, eo se sacrilega usurpatione privavit. Petrus a firma petra dicitur, quæ portas inferi confringit atque adamantino rigore destruit et dissipat quidquid obsistit.* † Lib. I. ep. 7. ‡ Lib. VI. ep. 35.

§ Lib. II. ep. 67. *Huic sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ semper licuit semperque licebit, contra noviter increcentes excessus nova quoque decreta atque remedia procurare, quæ rationis et auctoritatis edita iudicio nulli hominum sit fas ut irrita refutare.* And ep. 68: *Non nostra decreta, quanquam licenter si opus esset possumus, vobis proponimus.*

|| Lib. I. ep. 15: *In eo loco positi sumus, ut velimus nolimus omnibus gentibus, maxime Christianis, veritatem et justitiam annuntiare compellamur;* and now the passage: *maledictus homo, qui prohibet gladium suum a sanguine, which he explains thus: verbum prædicationis a carnalium increpatione.*

As the organs by which to extend and maintain his oversight over all the churches, and to exercise everywhere his juridical authority, he determined to make use of the institution of legates, which had been made a vital part of the papacy during the epoch of reform, in the time of Henry the Third. Since he could not be in all places at once, these legates were to act as his representatives and vicegerents, in upbuilding and destroying among the distant nations; and the bishops were to pay the same obedience to such legates as to the pope himself, and to stand by them in all cases; and he had the presumption to apply to this relation the words of our Lord to his apostles, declaring, that in them *he himself* was honoured or despised.\* At the same time, however, he did not allow these legates to act according to their own pleasure, but exercised a strict control over all their proceedings. He censured them, in right good earnest, if they failed to make an exact report of every matter to himself. He was a despot, determined to rule everywhere himself.† The gold which legates sent him, expecting by this means to pacify him, could not move him to release them from obligation to give in an exact account of all their transactions. To a certain legate, who contemplated something of this sort, he writes: "The fact that he had not personally brought in a report of all his proceedings admitted of no excuse, unless he was hindered by sickness, or had no possible means of returning." He reminded him of the fact, that he must have long since found out how small store he (the pope) set by money, separate from

\* Lib. V. ep. 2, regarding such a legate, whom he sent to Corsica: *Ut ea, quæ ad ordinem sacræ religionis pertinent, rite exequens juxta prophetæ dictum evellat et destruat, ædificet et plantet.* When in Bohemia, the authority of these legates was disputed as an innovation. Gregory promptly gave them his support. He thus writes on this subject to the Bohemian bishops, l. I. ep. 17: *Quidam vestrorum hoc quasi novum aliquid existimantes et non considerantes sententiam Domini dicentis: "qui vos recipit, me recipit, et qui vos spernit, me spernit." Legatos nostros contemptui habent ac proinde dum nullam debitam reverentiam exhibent, non eos, sed ipsam veritatis sententiam spernunt.*

† Thus he took to task a legate whom he had sent to Spain, and who held a council there, because he had not, either in person or by one of his associates, made report to the pope (l. I, ep. 16): *Quatenus perspectis omnibus confirmanda confirmaremus et si qua mutanda viderentur, discreta ratione mutaremus.*

the recognition of his authority.\* Furthermore, the annual synods, during the fasts preceding Easter, which were attended by bishops from all parts of the Western church,† were to serve as a means of making the pope acquainted with the condition of all the churches, and of helping him to maintain an oversight of their affairs. It is plain from many examples, how important he considered it to keep himself informed of the peculiarities, the particular condition and wants, even of the most distant nations, in order to meet their several necessities. Thus, for instance, he wrote to the king of Sweden, requesting him to send a bishop, or some ecclesiastic of suitable qualifications, to Rome, who could exactly inform him respecting the character of the country and the manners of the people, and who, after being fully instructed, could more safely convey back the papal ordinances to his native land.‡ To king Olov, of Norway, he wrote,§ “that it would give him great pleasure, were it in his power to send him qualified ecclesiastics for the instruction of his people; but as the remoteness of the country, and especially the want of a knowledge of the spoken language, rendered it extremely difficult to do this, he therefore requested him, as he had already done the king of Denmark, to send a few young people of the higher class to Rome, for the purpose of being accurately instructed there, under the protection of the apostles Peter and Paul, in the laws of God, so that they might convey back to their people the ordinances of the apostolical chair, and teach all they had learned to their countrymen, in their own language.” On many occasions he showed how little he was to be influenced in the transaction of business, by money. A certain count of Angers maintained an unlawful connection with a woman, and had for this reason been excommunicated by his bishop, whom he therefore persecuted; at the same time, however, he sent presents to the pope, hoping, doubtless, that by this course he should be able to conciliate his favour. The

\* *Nam pecunias sine honore quanti pretii habeam, tu ipse optime dudum potuisti perpendere.* Lib. VII. ep. 1.

† Two at least from each bishopric should take part therein. Lib. VII. ep. 1.

‡ Lib. VIII. ep. 1. *Qui et terræ vestræ habitudines gentisque mores nobis suggerere et apostolica mandata de cunctis pleniter instructus ad vos certius queat referre*

§ Lib. VI. ep. 13.

• pope sent them all back ; and wrote to the count that, until he had put away his sin, the head of the church could receive no presents from him, though he would not cease praying God to have mercy upon him.\* The pious queen Matilda of England wrote to him, that anything of hers which he might wish, she was ready to give him. The pope answered her : † “ What gold, what jewels, what precious objects of this world ought I to prefer to have from thee, rather than a chaste life, beneficence to the poor, love to God, and to thy neighbour ? ” In a letter to the king of Denmark, the pope, with other exhortations, urgently called upon him to put a stop to that abuse, in his country, by which during bad seasons and droughts, innocent women were persecuted as witches who had brought about these calamities. ‡ We have seen how a pope, by whom the papal authority was greatly increased, was the first to declare himself opposed to the employment of torture.§ We see in the present case how the individual by whose means the papal monarchy was advanced to a still greater height than ever, declared himself opposed to a superstition to which, in later times, by the trials for witchcraft, thousands must fall victims ! ¶ In taking the preparatory steps for a synod of reform, to be held under the presidency of his legate in England, against certain abuses which had crept in, he called upon the bishops ¶ to direct their attention and care particularly against the abuses of penance, and false confidence in priestly absolution : “ For if one who had been guilty of murder, perjury, adultery, or any of the like crimes persisted in such sins, or made traffic of them, which could

\* Lib. IX. ep. 22. *Munera tua ideo recipienda non esse arbitrati sumus quia divinis oculis oblatio non acceptabilis esse probatur, quamdiu a peccato isto immunem te non reddideris et ad gratiam omnipotentis Dei non redieris.*

† Lib. VII. ep. 26.

‡ Lib. VII. ep. 21. *In mulieres ob eandem causam simili immanitate barbari ritus damnatas quidquam impietatis faciendi vobis fas esse nolite putare, sed potius discite, divinæ ultionis sententiam digne pœnitendo avertere, quam in illas insontes frustra feraliter sæviendo iram Domini multo magis provocare.*

§ Nicholas the First, in his letter to the Bulgarian princes.

¶ We find also in Germany, even at this early period, the beginnings of the same mischief. In the year 1074, at Cologne, a woman whom people suspected to be a witch, was precipitated from the city wall, and killed. See Lambert of Aschaffenburg, at this year : ed. Krause, p. 136.

¶ Lib. VII. ep. 10.

hardly be done without sin, or bore weapons (except for the protection of his rights, or of his lord or friend, or of the poor, or for the defence of the church); or if one in so doing remained in possession of another's property, or harboured hatred of his neighbour; the penitence of such a person should in nowise be considered as real and sincere. That was to be called a repentance without fruits, where one persisted in the same sin, or in a similar and worse one, or a triflingly less one. True repentance consisted in a man's so turning back as to feel himself obliged to the faithful observance of his baptismal vow. Any other was sheer hypocrisy; and on none but him who did penance in the former of these ways, could he by virtue of his apostolical authority, bestow absolution."

Highly, again, as Gregory prized monasticism and the ascetical renunciation of the world; yet his predilection for this mode of life never moved him, in the case of such as could be more useful in the discharge of their functions in the position where God had placed them, and whose places could not easily be supplied, to approve the choice of this mode of life. The standard of love he designated as the standard by which everything relating to this matter should be estimated. Accordingly, he wrote to the Margravine Beatrice and her daughter Mathilda: \* "From love to God, to show love to our neighbour; to aid the unfortunate and the oppressed; this I consider more than prayer, fasting, vigils, and other good works, be they ever so many; for true love is more than the other virtues." "For," he adds, "if this mother of all the virtues, which moved God to come down from heaven to earth to bear our sorrows, were not my teacher; and if there were **any** one who would come forward in your place to help the oppressed churches, and serve the church universal; then would I exhort you to forsake the world with all its cares." In the same temper he rebuked abbot Hugo of Cluny † for receiving a pious prince to his order of monks. "Why do not you bethink yourself," he wrote, "of the great peril in which the church now stands? Where are they who, from love to God, are bold enough to stand firm against the impious, and to give up their lives for truth and justice? Behold! even such as seem to fear or to love God,

\* Lib. I. ep. 50.

† Lib. VI. ep. 7.

flee from the battle of Christ, neglect the salvation of their brethren, and, loving themselves only, seek repose." A hundred thousand Christians are robbed of their protection. Here and there, no doubt, God-fearing monks and priests are to be found; but a good prince is scarcely to be found anywhere. He admonishes him, therefore, to be more prudent for the future, and to esteem the love of God and of one's neighbour above all other virtues. The superior liberality of his views is shown by Gregory,\* in the judgment he passed on the controversy between the Greeks and Latins, concerning the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Lord's Supper. True, it is his will that the Latins should hold fast to their usage: yet he condemns not the Greeks, but applies in this case the words of Paul, "To the pure all things are pure." †

As Gregory had already, when a cardinal, made himself well known by principles so sharply defined, and so energetically carried out, ‡ so the commencement of his papal administration would make a very different impression according to the relation in which the two opposite parties stood to each other. One of these parties expected from him the long-desired reformation of the church; the other dreaded the severe judge and punisher of the abuses which had crept in; bishops and monarchs might well tremble.§ If the numerous party

\* We will, by way of addition, state this fact, also: The abbot Hugo of Cluny had inquired of the pope concerning Berengar. The answer could not perhaps be so easily and briefly given, as it would have been in case he could have declared him at once a false teacher: "*De Berengario.*" he wrote, in reply to abbot Hugo, "*unde nobis scripsistis, quid nobis videatur, vel quid disposuerimus, fratres, quos tibi remittimus cum prædicto cardinali nostro, nuntiabunt.*" Epp. Gregor. I. V. ep. 21.

† *Ipsorum fermentatum nec vituperamus nec reprobamus, sequentes apostolum dicentem mundis esse omnia munda.* Lib. VII. ep. 1.

‡ His name, Gregory VII., while it contains an expression of his enduring friendship, implies also a protestation against the interference of the emperor in the affairs of the papacy.

§ How he appeared to the pious men of his times, even such as did not belong to the zealots of the papal party, we may see from the judgment that Odericus Vitalis, of the monastery of St. Evreul in Normandy, passes upon him: he says of him, ed. Du Chesne, f. 639: *A puero monachus omnique vita sua sapientiæ et religioni admodum studuit assiduissime certamen contra peccatum exercuit.* Lambert of Aschaffenburg mentions him while he was yet a cardinal: *Abbas de sancto Paulo, vir et eloquentia et sacrarum literarum eruditione valde admirandus* and page 89, in *tota ecclesia omni virtutum genere celeberrimum.*

of bishops who were interested in the maintaining of old abuses, had had time for that purpose, doubtless they would have opposed the election of Hildebrand at every step, such reactions having already proceeded from that party at the end of the preceding period.\* Gregory fulfilled these ex-

\* Worthy of notice is the account of Lambert of Aschaffenburg, p. 89. Gregory having become well known on account of his ardent zeal for the cause of God (*zelo Dei ferventissimus*), the French bishops were filled with great anxiety, *ne vir vehementis ingenii et acris erga Deum fidei, districtius eos pro negligentis suis quandoque discuteret*, and they had therefore been very importunate with king Henry the Fourth, that he should declare the election which had taken place without his concurrence to be null and void; for unless he anticipated the attack of the pope, the latter would come down upon no one with more severity than himself. Henry, therefore, immediately sent count Eberhard to Rome, with instructions to bring the Roman nobles to account for having, in contrariety to ancient usage, set up a pope without the concurrence of the king; and, in case it happened that Gregory would not give the proper satisfaction, to insist upon his abdication. The pope received him kindly, and called God to witness, that this dignity was forced upon him by the Romans; at the same time, however, his ordination was put off till he should learn of the concurrence of the king and of the German princes. With this explanation the king was satisfied, and so Gregory's consecration took place. Were we warranted to give any credit to this account, then Gregory's adroitness, in suiting his conduct to the circumstances, would have descended in this case to actual dishonesty; the end must have been thought by him to sanctify the means; for assuredly, according to Hildebrand's principles, the validity of a papal election could not be dependent on any such circumstances. Certain it is, that he was, from the first, determined to dispute such a position most decidedly. He must have yielded only for the moment, because he did not believe himself, as yet, strong enough to maintain his ground in a quarrel with the imperial party, or wished at least to guard against a dangerous schism. We must admit it to be not at all improbable, that such attempts might be made on Henry the Fourth by the anti-Hildebrandian party; but it is hardly possible to believe that Gregory, after having under the preceding reign so decidedly repelled any such concession, should have yielded so much as is here stated: for the consequences which might be drawn from his conduct in such a case could be plainly foreseen. Moreover, the silence observed in the writings of the opposite party, which would not have failed to produce this fact against Gregory if there had been any truth in it, bears testimony against the credibility of the story. Bishop Henry of Speier, who in his ferocious letter against Gregory the Seventh (in *Eccard. Scriptores rer. Germ. T. II. f. 762*), would scarcely have omitted to make use of this along with his other charges against him, brings it against him simply that when a cardinal he had bound himself by oath to the emperor, Henry the Third, never to accept the papal dignity, during his own or his son's lifetime, without his consent, nor to suffer that any other person should become pope without the same.

expectations. He convoked a synod to meet at Rome on the first fast-week of the year, whose business it should be to vindicate the freedom of the church, to promote the interests of religion, and to prevent an irremediable corruption which was coming upon the church. In the letters missive for this council,\* he depicts in glaring colours, but in a way certainly not differing from the truth, the then corrupt condition of the church: that the princes serving only their own selfish interests, setting all reverence aside, oppressed the church as a poor miserable handmaiden, and sacrificed her to the indulgence of their own desires. But the priests had entirely forgotten the obligations under which they were laid, by their holy vocation, to God, and to the sheep intrusted to their care; by their spiritual dignities, they only sought to attain to honour in the world; and the property which was designed to subserve the benefit of many, was squandered away by them on idle state and in superfluous expenditures. And as the communities thus suffered under an entire want of instruction and guidance in righteousness; as, instead thereof, they could only learn from the example of those set over them what was contrary to Christianity, so *they* too gave themselves up to all wickedness; and not only the practical living out, but well-nigh all knowledge even, of the doctrines of faith was wanting.

At this fast-synod, in the year 1074, the principles were carried out by which it had been already attempted, under the reigns of the recent popes, to improve the condition of the church, which had sunk so low. The repeated papal ordinances would still seem, however, to have accomplished nothing; in many countries they seem to have been as good as not known, as appears evident from the reception which the newly inculcated laws met with. Gregory not only repeated, at this synod, the ordinances against simony in the bestowment of benefices and against matrimonial connections of the clergy, which he plainly designates as "fornication;" he declared not only that those ecclesiastics who had obtained their offices in the way just mentioned, and those who lived in such unlawful connections, were incapable henceforth of administering the functions of their office;† but he also

\* Lib. I. ep. 42.

† Si qui sunt presbyteri vel diaconi vel subdiaconi, qui in crimine for-



addressed himself anew to the laity, with a view to stir them up against the clergy who would not obey. "If, however, they resolve to persist in their sins," says he of those clergy, "then let no one of you allow himself to hear mass from them; for their blessing will be converted into a curse, their prayer into sin, as the prophet speaks: 'I will curse your blessings,' " Malach. ii. 12.\* It was the pope's design, as he himself even avowed, to compel those ecclesiastics who would not obey from a sense of duty, to do so by exposing them to the detestation of the people.† Gregory, however, did not rest satisfied with merely having these laws published at the Roman synod; he also transmitted them to those bishops who had not been present at the synod, making it, at the same time, imperative on them to see that they were put in force: and the legates, whom he sent forth in all directions, served as his agents to promulgate them everywhere, and to take care that they should be obeyed.

But the most violent commotions broke out in France and Germany on the publication of the law against the marriage of the clergy. In this instance was displayed the resistance of the German spirit, some symptoms of which had already been manifested at the time of the planting of the German church by Boniface, against this attempt to curtail man of his humanity. It was as if an entirely new and unheard of law was promulgated; and the German spirit was prepared, even now, to feel the contradiction between this law and original Christianity—to contrast the declarations of Christ and the apostles with the arbitrary will of the pope. Such remonstrances as the following were uttered against the pope, in Germany: ‡—"Forgetting the word of the Lord (Matt. xix.

*nicationis jaceant, interdicimus iis ex parte Dei omnipotentis et S. Petri auctoritate ecclesiar introitum, usque dum peniteant et emendent.*

\* This ordinance is cited in this form by Geroch of Reichersberg, in Ps. x. Pez. l. c. t. v. f. 157. Mansi Concil. xx. f. 434.

† As he himself says, in his letter to bishop Otto of Constance: *Ut qui pro amore Dei et officii dignitate non corriguntur, verecundia seculi et oburgatione populi resipiscant.*

‡ Lambert of Aschaffenburg, who did not himself belong to this anti-Hildebrandian party, in his History of Germany (at the year 1074), expresses himself in the following strong language: *Adversus hoc decretum protinus vehementer infremuit tota factio clericorum, hominem plane hæreticum et vesani dogmatis esse clamitans.*

11), as well as that of the apostle Paul (1 Corinth. vii. 9), he would force men, by tyrannical compulsion, to live as the angels; and, by seeking to suppress the very dictates of nature, he was throwing open a wide door for all impurity of manners. Unless he withdrew these decrees, they would prefer rather to renounce the priesthood than their marriage covenant; and then he, for whom men were not good enough, might look about for angels to preside over the churches.”

The archbishop Sigfrid of Mentz wished to prepare his clergy by one step at a time. He allowed them half a year for consideration, exhorting them, however, to undertake voluntarily that which they must otherwise do by constraint, and imploring them not to put him and the pope under the necessity of resorting to severer measures against them.\* This indulgence, however, did not help the matter, for when the archbishop, at a synod held in Erfurt in the month of October, required of the clergy that they should either separate from their wives or resign their places, he met with the most violent resistance. In vain he declared to them that he did not act according to his own inclination, but was obliged to yield to the authority of the pope; they threatened him with deposition and death if he persisted in carrying this measure through. He saw himself forced to let the matter rest for the present, and promised that he would make a report to the pope, and try what could be done. Accordingly, he wrote to the pope, excusing himself on the ground of the impossibility, under the unfavourable circumstances, of showing obedience, as he wished, in all that the pope required. In this letter he says—“In regard to the chastity of the clergy and the crime of heresy, as well as everything else which you propose to me, I shall ever, so far as God gives me the ability, obey him and you. It would, however, correspond to apostolical gentleness and fatherly love, so to modify your ecclesiastical ordinances, as that some regard might be had to the circumstances of the time and to that which is practicable in individual cases; so that, while there shall be no lack of strict discipline towards transgressors, there shall neither be any want of a charitable compassion towards those who are sick and need a physician; and that the measure of justice

\* See Lambert, p. 146.

may not exceed the limits of apostolical prudence and paternal love." \* But no excuses were availing with the pope. In an answer to two letters,† he replied to him ‡ that, "no doubt, according to man's judgment, he had adduced weighty grounds of excuse; but nothing of all this could excuse him, however, before the Divine tribunal, for neglecting that which was requisite for the salvation of the souls committed to his care—no loss of goods, no hatred of the wicked, no wrath of the powerful, no peril even of his life; for to be ready to make all these sacrifices was the very thing that distinguished the shepherd from the hireling." "It is a fact that must redound greatly to our shame," said the pope, in conclusion, "that the warriors of this world take their posts every day in the line of battle for their earthly sovereigns, and scarcely feel a fear of exposing their lives to hazard; and should not we, who are called priests of the Lord, fight for our king, who created all things from nothing, who cheerfully laid down his life for us, and who promises us eternal felicity?" And he persisted in requiring that the laws which had been passed respecting simony and the marriage of the clergy should at any rate be carried into effect, rejecting every modification on these points. § A second synod was held at Erfurt, at which a papal legate was present to enforce obedience; but he, too, came near losing his life in the tumult which ensued, and could accomplish nothing. The archbishop contented himself with ordering that, *in future*, none but unmarried persons should be elected to spiritual offices, and that at ordina-

\* Erit autem apostolicæ mansuetudinis et paternæ dilectionis, sic ad fratres mandata dirigere ecclesiastica, ut et temporum opportunitates et singulorum possibilitatem dignemini inspicere, ut et deviantibus et discoloris adhibeatur disciplina, quæ debetur, et infirmis et opus habentibus medico compassio caritatis non negetur: sæpeque examinatis negotiorum causis adhibeatur iudicii censura, ut apostolicæ discretionis et paternæ pietatis modum non excedat justitiæ mensura. Mansi Consil. XX. f. 434.

† In the second, he had excused himself on the ground that, under the existing circumstances, and on account of civil disputes and disturbances, he could not hold the required council of reform.

‡ Lib. III. ep. 4.

§ Hoc autem tuæ fraternitati injungimus, quatenus de simoniaca hæresi ac fornicatione clericorum, sicut ab apostolica sede accepisti, studiosè perquiras et quidquid retroactum inveneris, legaliter punias et funditus reseces: ac ne quidquid ulterius fiat, penitus interdicas.

tion every candidate should obligate himself to observe the law of celibacy.

The pope, who was soon informed of everything that transpired, by the multitudes who came from different regions to Rome,\* learned that Gebhard, archbishop of Salzburg, although he had himself been present at the synod, yet let his clergy go on in the old way: for this the pope addressed him a letter of sharp remonstrance.† In like manner he testified his displeasure to bishop Otto of Costnitz, about whom he had heard similar reports. "How should an ecclesiastic, living in concubinage," he asks, "be competent to administer the sacraments, when, in fact, such a person is not even worthy of receiving them; when the most humble layman living in such unlawful connection would certainly be excluded from the church-communion?"‡ He constantly assumed that marriage contracted by a clergyman in defiance of the ecclesiastical laws was nothing better than concubinage.

Gregory reckoned upon being upheld by the people; and he might, without advancing another step, simply leave his ordinances to operate among the people—here he would have found the most powerful support. As it had happened already, at the close of the preceding period, the cause of the papacy against a corrupted clergy had now become the cause of the people. Gregory had, in fact, already appealed to the people, when he called on them not to accept the sacerdotal acts from ecclesiastics living in unlawful connections, while he at the same time exhibited their character in so hateful a light. He moreover made a direct call upon powerful laymen for their active co-operation in enforcing the obedience which should be rendered to those laws. Thus he wrote to those princes on whose submission and interest, in behalf

\* Lib. IX. ep. 1. Ab ipsis mundi finibus etiam gentes noviter ad fidem conversæ student annue tam mulieres quam viri ad eum (S. Petrum) venire.

† Ut clericos, qui turpiter conversantur, pastorali vigore coercere. Lib. I. ep. 30.

‡ Nos si vel extremum laicum pellicatui adhærentem aliquando cognoverimus, hunc velut præcisum a dominico corpore membrum, donec pœniteat, condigne a sacramento altaris arcemus, quomodo ergo sacramentorum distributor vel minister ecclesiæ debet esse, qui nulla ratione debet esse particeps? Eccard, Scriptores rer. Germanicar. II. ep. 142.

of the cause of piety, he thought he might safely rely.\* He exhorted them, in the most urgent manner, to refuse accepting any priestly performance at the hands of clergy who had obtained their places by simony, or who lived in unchastity.† They were requested to publish these laws everywhere; and, if it should be necessary, hinder even by force such ecclesiastics from administering the sacraments:‡ they were not to be put at fault, if the bishops neglected their duty and kept silent, or even spoke against them.§ If it should be objected to them, that this did not belong to their calling, still they should not desist from labouring for their own and the people's salvation; they should, on the contrary, appeal to the pope, who had laid upon them this charge.¶ He himself says—"Since, by so many ordinances, from the time of Leo the Ninth, nothing has been effected,¶ it is far better to strike out a new path than to let the laws sleep and the souls of men perish also."\*\* He had allied himself with the pious laity against the corrupted clergy, he expresses his joy that he had done so, and thanks God that men and women of the lay order, notwithstanding the bad example of the clergy, were ready to give themselves up to the interests of piety. He calls upon such not to suffer themselves to be

\* Lib. II. ep. 45.

† Vos officium eorum, quos aut simoniace promotos et ordinatos aut in crimine fornicationis jacentes cognoveritis, nullatenus recipiatis.

‡ Et hæc eadem adstricti per obedientiam tam in curia regis quam per alia loca et conventus regni notificantes ac persuadentes, quantum potestis, tales sacrosanctis deservire mysteriis, etiam vi, si oportuerit, prohibeat.

§ Quidquid episcopi dehinc loquantur aut taceant.

¶ Si qui autem contra vos quasi istud officii vestri non esse, aliquid garrire incipiant, hoc illis respondete: ut vestram et populi salutem non impredientes, de injuncta vobis obedientia ad nos nobiscum disputaturi veniant.

¶ Concerning those laws: Quæ cum sancta et apostolica mater ecclesia jam a tempore b. Leonis papæ sæpe in conciliis tum per legatos tum per epistolas in se et commissas sibi plebes, utpote ab antiquioribus neglectas, renovare et observare commonuerit, rogaverit et accepta per Petrum auctoritate jussit, adhuc inobedientes, exceptis perpaucis, tam execrandam consuetudinem nulla studuerunt prohibitione decidere, nulla distractione punire.

\*\* Multo enim melius nobis videtur, justitiam Dei vel novis reâdificare consiliis, quam animas hominum una cum legibus deperire neglectis.

alarmed by the cry of the latter, who thought themselves entitled to despise such laymen as ignorant persons.\*

Again, Gregory found a peculiar kind of support in those monks who travelled about as preachers of repentance, had the greatest influence among the people, and sided with the popes in combating the prevailing corruption of manners and the vicious clergy. There were some among these inflamed by the ardour of genuine piety, but there were others inspired only by fanaticism or ambition;† hence the monks drew upon themselves, as a class, the hatred of the anti-Hildebrandian party. They were represented by the men who stood at the head of that party as pharisees, promoters of spiritual darkness, and zealots for human ordinances.‡ In the

\* Lib. II. ep. 11. Quapropter quidquid illi contra vos imo contra justitiam garriant et pro defendenda nequitia sua vobis, qui illiterati estis, objiciant, vos in puritate et constantia fidei vestræ permanentes, quæ de episcopis et sacerdotibus simoniaciis aut in fornicatione jacentibus ab apostolica sede accepistis, firmiter credite et tenete. In a letter which is addressed to the bishop and the communities at the same time, he calls upon both to labour together for the same object. Lib. II. ep. 55.

† When the decrees of that Roman council were made known at a synod held in Paris, nearly all the bishops, abbots, and clergy protested against them, declaring importabilia esse præcepta ideoque irrationabilia. Walter, abbot of the monastery of St. Martin, near Pontisara (Pontoise), the fierce antagonist of simony, who fearlessly told the truth to king Philip the First, was the only one who stood up for these laws, on the principle of the respect which in every case was due to superiors. Churchmen and people of the court attacked him on all sides; but he was not to be moved by any authority nor by any threats. See his Life, written by one of his disciples; c. ii. s. 10, t. 1. Mens. April, f. 760. Even down to the early part of the twelfth century, to the time of pope Paschalis the Second, the papal laws of celibacy were so little observed in Normandy, that priests celebrated their weddings openly, passed their livings to their sons by inheritance, or gave them as a dowry to their daughters, if they had no other property. Their wives, before they married, took an oath before their parents, that they would never forsake their husbands. When, however, the monk Bernard (abbot of Tira in the diocese of Chartres), itinerated at that time in Normandy as a preacher of repentance, being a man of true piety, who had great influence on the people, he stood forth in opposition to such ecclesiastics, and sharply rebuked them in his discourses. Some gave heed to his exhortations, but the greater number continued to pursue their old course of life. The wives of the priests with their whole retinue, and the clergy themselves, persecuted him. They tried to bring it about that he should be forbidden to preach. See the Life of this man, at April 14, c. vi. s. 51, t. II. f. 234.

‡ The fierce opponent of the Hildebrandian party, and zealous champion

anti-Hildebrandian party we must distinguish two classes—those who, contending only for their own personal advantage and the maintenance of old abuses, were farthest removed from the interest of culture; and those who strove for the cause of a well-grounded conviction—representatives of a freer spirit,\* which they had contracted from the study of the Bible and of the older church-teachers, and which would incite them to push their studies still farther in the same direction. To such, the monks contending for the Hildebrandian system might well appear to be no better than *Obscurantists*.

Thus Gregory must unite himself with the monks against the bishops as well as against the princes. We see how he takes the part of the former against that free-minded bishop, Cunibert of Turin; and it may be a question on which side the right was in this dispute, whether the quarrel was not connected with the universal contest about principles which agitated these times. Remarkable is the language which Gregory, in a threatening tone, addresses to this bishop, that “the earlier popes had made pious monasteries free from all relations of dependence on the bishops, and bishoprics free from the oversight of the metropolitans, in order to protect

for the cause of the emperor Henry the Fourth, bishop Waltram of Naumburg, attacked the monks as pharisees (*Obscurantes*), who zealously contended for human traditions, prevented instruction in their monasteries, and sought to keep the youth, from the first, in ignorance and stupidity. *Mirandum est valde, quod nolunt aliqui, præcipue autem monachi, quæ præclara sunt discere, qui ne pueros quidem vel adolescentes permittunt in monasteriis habere studium salutaris scientiæ, ut scilicet rude ingenium nutriatur siliquis dæmoniorum, quæ sunt consuetudines humanarum traditionum, ut ejusmodi spurcitiis assuefacti non possint gustare, quam suavis est Dominus, qui dicit in evangelio de talibus: vae vobis scribæ et pharisæi hypocritæ, vos enim non intratis, nec sinitis introeuntes intrare.* Apolog. Lib. II. p. 170, in Goldast. Apol. pro Henrico Quarto. Hanovæ, 1611.

\* Gerhoh of Reichersberg complains of the wresting of the Scriptures which the defender of Simony and of Nicolaitism (as the defence of the marriage of priests was termed) resorted to: *Ipsi Simoniaci et Nicolaitæ obtinuerunt divitias corporales et spirituales, nam possident ecclesias et sciunt scripturas et ideo de ipsis scripturis et novi testamenti intenderunt arcum ad se detorquendo et flectendo sensum eorum juxta errorem suum.* It is evident, then, that the educated men of the anti-Hildebrandian party took pains to study the bible; and what Gerhoh calls wresting of the Scriptures, was sometimes the right interpretation of the bible.

them against the enmity of their superiors, so that they might ever stand free and immediately connected, as more illustrious members, with the head, the apostolical see.\* Here we discern that tendency of papal absolutism which was seeking to dissolve the existing legitimate gradation of the church-organism, and to procure organs everywhere which should be immediately dependent on and serviceable to itself. It was made therefore a special matter of reproach against Gregory the Seventh, by the defenders of the opposite system, that he paid no regard whatever to the specific rights of any ecclesiastical authority.†

But the passions of the people having once been excited against the clergy, there arose, to a still greater extent than we observe on the like occasion in any former period, separatist movements, and the passions of the people went beyond the limits fixed by the popes. Laymen stood forth who, while they declared the sacraments administered by the corrupted clergy to be without validity, took the liberty themselves to baptize. We may well believe, too, the remark of a historian of this period,‡ hostilely disposed to this pope, that, in a state of the nations which still continued to be so rude, the fanaticism excited by the pope against the married clergy, manifested itself in the wildest outbreaks, and even led to a profanation of the sacraments. Heretical tendencies might easily spring up out of this insurrection against the corrupted clergy and this separatism, or find in them a point of attachment. It was an easy thing for all who understood how to take advantage of the excited feelings of the people, to use them for their own ends, and as a means to obtain followers. Certain it is, that the heretical sects, which in the twelfth century spread with so much power, especially in Italy, were by this ferment not a little promoted,§ as the

\* Lib. II. ep. 69. *Perpetua libertate donantes apostolicæ sedi velut principalia capituli duo membra adhærere sanxerunt.*

† See the letter of the bishop of Speier against Gregory: *Sublata quantum in te fuit, omni potestate episcopis, quæ eis divinitus per gratiam Spiritus sancti collata esse dinoscitur, dum nemo jam alicui episcopus aut presbyter est, nisi qui hoc indignissima assentatione a fastu tuo emendicavit.* See Eccard, l. c. ii. f. 762.

‡ See the remarks of Sigebert of Gemblours, cited below.

§ This may be gathered even from the remarkable account of the historian Sigebert of Gemblours. *Continentiam paucis tenentibus, ali-*



sectarian name of the Patarenes itself indicates. The demagogical tendency was especially objected to the pope by his adversaries; and it was said, that he made use of the popular fury as a means of procuring obedience to his laws.\* How easily the people, in a time of barbarism, might pass over from a superstitious veneration of the clergy to a fanatical detestation of them, may be seen from the example in Denmark, which perhaps was connected with these movements excited by the pope himself. The people, on occasions of public calamity, a bad atmosphere, droughts, failure of crops, were wont to complain of the clergy, and to rage against them; hence, the pope himself was under the necessity of exhorting them to show a becoming reverence to the priests.†

All this now furnished grounds for various complaints against the pope. Even those who approved the laws respecting celibacy, in themselves considered, still could not approve

quibus eam modo causa quæstus ac jaectantiæ simulantibus, multis incontinentiam perjurio (since they put themselves under an obligation, at their ordination, to observe the law of celibacy, and yet were not enabled to keep it), cumulantibus ad hoc hac opportunitate laicis insurgentibus contra sacros ordines, et se ab omni ecclesiastica subjectione excutientibus, laici sacra mysteria temerant et de his disputant, infantes baptizant, sordido humore aurium pro sacro oleo et chrismate utentes, in extremo vite viaticum dominicum et usitatum ecclesiæ obsequium sepulturæ a presbyteris conjugatis accipere parvi pendunt, decimas presbyteris deputatas igni cremant, et ut in uno cætera perpendas, laici corpus Domini a presbyteris conjugatis consecratum, sæpe pedibus conculcaverunt et sanguinem Domini voluntarie effuderunt, et multa alia contra jus et fas in ecclesia gesta sunt, et hac occasione *multi pseudomagistri* exurgentes in ecclesia, *profanis novitatibus plebem ab ecclesiastica disciplina arvertunt*. Although this account, as proceeding from an opponent of the Hildebrandian party, might excite suspicion, yet certainly in all essential points it is in conformity with the truth.

\* In the letter of Theodoric of Verdun: *Legem de clericorum incontinentia per laicorum insanias cohibenda, legem ad scandalum in ecclesia mittendum tartaro vomente prolatam*. Martene et Durand, thes. nov. anecdoto. T. I. f. 218. And Henry, bishop of Speier, says, in the letter above cited: *Omnis rerum ecclesiasticarum administratio plebejo furori per te attributa*.

† His way of doing this discovers, in a characteristic manner, the more Jewish than Christian position on which he stood. *Quod quam grave peccatum sit, ex eo liquido potestis advertere, quod Judæis etiam sacerdotibus ipse salvator noster lepra purgatos eis mittendo honorem exhibuerit cæterisque servandum esse quæ illi dixissent, præcepit, quum profecto vestri qualescunque habeantur, tamen illis longe sint meliores*. Lib. VII. ep. 21.

the means which he employed to enforce obedience to them ; and they thought he ought to have been content to establish these laws on a firm foundation for the future, and to enforce obedience to them in all following time. But they found fault with him because he showed no indulgence to those clergymen who were already bound by the ties of wedlock ; because he was for having everything done at once, and paid no regard to the weakness of mankind ; because he did not copy the example of Christ, in bearing with the infirmities of his disciples ; because he was for pouring the new wine into old bottles, and stirring up the people so cruelly against the clergy. By all the laws in the world, said they, that cannot possibly be brought about by force which grace alone can effect by working from within. Hence every good man should be more ready to pray for the weak than to involve them in such persecutions.\*

Furthermore, the manner in which Gregory had expressed himself respecting the sacramental acts performed by unworthy ecclesiastics, gave occasion to the charge, that he made the validity and force of the sacraments depend on the subjective character of the priest : which stood at variance with the doctrine concerning the objective validity of the sacraments recognized ever since the controversies between Cyprian and the church of Rome.†

\* The words of priest Alboin, in his second letter against priest Bernold of Constance: *Nonne etiam ipse summus pontifex, qui cœlos penetravit, non omnes hoc verbum castitatis capere, neque etiam novum mustum in veteres uteres fundi convenire, insuper rudes discipulos, quamdiu cum illis sponsum est, non jejunare profitetur, infirmitatibus nostris misericorditer compati non dedignatur.* As Christ, the great physician, received publicans and sinners among his table companions. But one will say: Yes, after they manifested repentance. Well, but who brought them to repentance? Assuredly, Christ alone. *Profecto filius hominis, qui de cœlo descendit, Zachæo sui occulta inspiratione adscensionem arboris persuasit.* Sic etiam nunc, nisi ille *omnia trahens ad se occulto suæ gratiæ metu nos miseros trahat, procul dubio nostri Pape auctoritas vacillat.* Agnum cum lupo vesci confitetur dextera excelsi. Proinde quemque piorum magis deceret pro infirmis orare, quam in istis malis diebus *tot persecutorum* super eos jugum ducere. Ed. Goldast. l. c. pag. 42.

† See Waltram of Naumburg, l. III. c. 3. Gerhoh of Reichersberg takes great pains to defend the pope against the accusation of those who said: *Non potest pollui verbum Dei, non potest impedi gratia Dei, quin suos effectus operetur, etiam per ministros, Judæ traditori similes.* He grants this to be true in reference to those whose vices are not yet openly

Although those first ordinances of the pope had already excited so violent a ferment, he yet, unmoved by that circumstance, proceeded to take another step. In order to cut off entirely the fountain-head of simony, and to deprive the secular power of all influence in the appointments to spiritual offices, the *right of investiture*, by virtue of which the laity might always exercise a certain influence of this sort, was to be wholly denied them. At a second fast-synod of reform, held at Rome the year 1075, he issued the ordinance: "If any person in future accepts a bishopric or an abbacy from the hands of a layman, such person shall not be regarded as a bishop or an abbot, nor shall he enter a church, till he has given up the place thus illegally obtained. The same thing should hold good also of the lower church offices; and every individual, be he emperor or king, who bestows investiture in connection with such an office, should be excluded from church-communion."\* Gregory and his party maintained that on this point also they only restored to the ancient ecclesiastical laws the authority which belonged to them; that being reduced to practice, which these laws had determined with regard to the freedom of church elections. He was praised as the restorer of free church elections; and men were indebted to him for the rescue of the church from utter ruin, which venality, and hence bad appointments to all offices, from the highest to the lowest, must have for their consequence.† By the other party, however, it was made out, in

known; but the case is different, he maintains, after such worthless clergymen have been deposed by the pope; just as Judas, after he had become exposed, and had left the ranks of the disciples, no longer took part with them in any religious act. See l. c. pag. 154 seq. We see from what he says, how much talk there was at that time on this subject on both sides. In a much more able manner than Gerhoh, Anselm of Canterbury defends, at one and the same time, the objective validity of the sacraments and the papal law, the sense of which was not, *quo quis ea, quæ tractant, contemnenda, sed tractandos execrandos existimet, ut qui Dei et Angelorum præsentiam non reverentur, vel hominum detestatione repulsi, sacra contaminare desistant.* Lib. I. ep. 56.

\* See this decree in the work which that zealous defender of Gregory's course, Anselm, bishop of Lucca, wrote against his adversary Guibert. T. III. p. i. lib. II. f. 383. Canis lect. antiq. ed. Basnage.

† Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who wrote after the middle of the twelfth century, reckons the restoration of free ecclesiastical elections among the works of the Holy Spirit in his times. *Hæc sunt pia de spiritu pietatis*

defence of the rights of monarchs, that if the bishops and abbots were willing to receive from them civil immunities and possessions, they must also bind themselves to the fulfilment of the duties therewith connected. This was the beginning of a long-continued contest between the papacy and the secular power.

The above-mentioned decrees the pope now sought to carry into execution against princes and prelates. He threatened the young Philip the First of France with excommunication, the interdict, and deposition, if he refused to reform. In a letter to the French bishops,\* he describes the sad condition of France, where no rights, human or divine, were respected, where rapine and adultery reigned with impunity.† He made it a matter of severest reproach to the bishops, that they did not restrain the king from such acts. They had not a shadow of excuse to plead. They were much mistaken if they supposed that they acted against the oath of fidelity which they had taken, when they prevented him from sinning; for it was a far greater act of fidelity to rescue another against his own will from making shipwreck of his soul, than by an injurious acquiescence to allow him to perish in the vortex of his guilt. The plea of fear could not excuse them in the least; for if they were united in each other in defending justice and right, they would have such power, that without any danger whatsoever, they might draw him from all his accustomed vices, and at the same time deliver their own souls; although, to say truth, not even the fear of death should hinder them from discharging the duties of their priestly vocation. If the king

*provenientia spectacula, cujus operationi et hoc assignamus, quod in diebus istis magna est libertas canonicis electionibus episcoporum, abbatum, prapositorum, et aliarum ecclesiasticarum personarum provehendarum in dignitatibus, quas per multos annos pæne a temporibus Ottonis primi, imperatoris usque ad imperatorem Henricum quartum, vendere solebant ipsi reges vel imperatores regnante ubique simonia, dum per simoniacos episcopos in cathedra pestilentie positos mortifera illa pestis dilata est usque ad infimos plebanos et capellanos, per quos valde multiplicatos, ecclesia pæne tota firdabatur, usque ad Gregorium septimum, qui se opposuit murum pro domo Israël, reparando in ecclesia canonicas electiones juxta pristinas canonum sanctiones. In Ps. xxxix. l. c. f. 793.*

\* Lib. II. ep. 5.

† Quod nusquam terrarum est, cives, propinqui, fratres etiam alii alios propter cupiditatem capiunt et omnia bona eorum ab illis extorquentes, vitam in extrema miseria finire faciunt.

would not listen to their representations, they should ~~then~~ renounce all fellowship with him, and impose the interdict on all France. And at the same time, Gregory declared: "Let every man know that, should the king even then show no signs of repentance, he would, with God's help, take every measure within his reach to wrest the kingdom of France from his hands."\*

Hermann, bishop of Bamberg (a man who lacked every other qualification as well as the knowledge required by his office),† formerly vice-dominus at Mentz, had in the year 1065, with a large sum of money, procured for himself the episcopal dignity in Bamberg.‡ In vain did this man try to deceive the pope by professions of repentance. In vain did his friend, archbishop Sigfrid of Mentz, go in person to Rome, and use all his influence to soften the feelings of the pope towards him. He had to be content that no worse punishment befel himself; that he was not himself put out of his office, because he had ordained that bishop. The pope commanded him to withdraw himself from all fellowship with the bishop of Bamberg, to publish the papal sentence of excommunication against him in all Germany, and to see to it, that another should be elected as soon as possible. No other hope now remaining to bishop Hermann, he proceeded himself, with advocates to defend his cause, to Rome, intending to effect his object by intrigue and bribery; but he dared not appear personally before the pope.§ He endeavoured to carry on his cause in Rome simply by his money and his lawyers; but he found himself disappointed in his expectations. Gregory was

\* *Nulli clam aut dubium esse volumus, quin modis omnibus regnum Franciæ de ejus occupatione, adjuvante Deo, tentemus eripere.*

† A remarkable illustration of his ignorance is a case cited by Lambert of Aschaffenburg, A.D. 1075, p. 154. • When the clerus of Bamberg, taking advantage of the authority of the papal legate, rose in resistance against their bishop, a young clergyman stood forth, and declared that, if the bishop showed himself able to translate, word for word, a single verse from the Psalter, they would acknowledge him as bishop on the spot.

‡ See Lambert, l. c. p. 44.

§ From Lambert's words, l. c. p. 156, we should infer, it is true, that he himself had come to Rome; but it is evident from a letter of pope Gregory, that he did not execute this resolution. In the letter to king Henry, lib. III. ep. 3: *Simoniacus ille Herimannus dictus episcopus hoc anno ad synodum Romam vocatus venire contempsit; sed cum propius Romam accessisset, in itinere substitit.*

inaccessible to such influences ; and it is a proof of the power which he exercised over all that were about him that, even at the Roman court, arts of bribery, which at other times had been so common and so successful here, could now effect nothing.\* No other way, therefore, remained for him, but unconditional submission to the irrevocable judgment of the pope. He obtained only the assurance of the papal absolution, on promising that, after his return, he would retire to a monastery, for the purpose of there doing penance. But when he came back, the manner in which he had been treated by the pope excited great indignation in the knights who espoused his cause ; they called it an unheard-of thing, that the pope, without any regular trial, should presume to depose a high spiritual dignitary of the empire. The bishop now threw himself upon these knights, who were his only reliance, and treated the papal excommunication as null ; yet all others avoided intercourse with him as an excommunicated person. None would receive from him any sacerdotal act, and he could only decide on questions of secular property. The pope pronounced on him the anathema ; and as he finally succeeded in having another bishop appointed, Hermann was obliged to yield. The deposed bishop, driven by necessity, retired to the monastery of Schwartzach, in the territory of Würzburg, and then went with the abbot of this convent to Rome. Now, for the first time, the pope bestowed upon him absolution, and gave him permission to perform sacerdotal functions, with the understood condition, however, that he was ever to remain excluded from the episcopal dignity.

King Henry, who most favoured the abuses attacked by the pope by an administration wholly surrendered to arbitrary will, was induced, on account of his then political situation, to yield compliance. Through the mediation of his pious mother Agnes, a reconciliation took place between him and the pope ; he dismissed the ministers on whom, because they encouraged

\* Lambert of Aschaffenburg says rightly : *Sed Romani pontificis constantia et invictus adversus avaritiam animus omnia excludebat argumenta humanæ fallaciæ*, which is confirmed by Gregory's way of expressing himself on the subject : *Præmittens nuntios suos cum copiosis muneribus noto sibi artificio innocentiam nostram et confratrum nostrorum integritatem pactione pecuniæ attentare atque, si fieri posset, corrumpere molitus est. Quod ubi præter spem evenit, etc.*

simony, excommunication had been pronounced, and expressed a willingness to obey the pope in all things, so that the latter signified his entire satisfaction with him, and the best hopes for the future. Already Gregory was employed, during this momentary interval of peace, in sketching the outlines of a great plan, for the execution of which he invited the co-operation of king Henry. The idea of a crusade, first broached by Sylvester the Second, was now taken up again by him. We have observed how Gregory lamented over the separation of the Western from the Eastern church, and the sad condition of Oriental Christendom, overrun by the Saracens. He had been invited from the East to procure the assistance of the West in behalf of the oppressed Christian brethren of the East. The hope was opened out to him, of liberating the holy places from the yoke of the infidels, of once more uniting together the East and the West in one community of faith and church-fellowship, and of thus extending his spiritual prerogative over the former as well as the latter. Fifty thousand men were already prepared to march under his priestly direction to the East.\* "Since our fathers," he wrote, "have, for the confirmation of the Catholic faith, often trod those countries, so will we, sustained by the prayers of all Christians, if under the leading of Christ the way shall be opened to us,—for it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps, but the ordering of our ways is of the Lord,—for the sake of the same faith and for the defence of Christians go thither also." And in communicating this purpose to king Henry, he asked his counsels and support; he would during his absence commend the Roman church to his protection. But soon Gregory became involved in violent disputes, which no longer permitted him to think of executing so vast a plan.

The young king Henry, following his own inclinations, would be more ready to agree with the opponents of the Hildebrandian system than with its adherents, for Gregory's severity could not possibly be agreeable to him; and men were not wanting who wished to make use of him as a bulwark against the rigid, inflexible pope, and these invited him to

\* Lib. II. ep. 31. Jam ultra quinquaginta millia ad hoc se præparant, ut si me possunt in expeditione pro duce ac pontifice habere, armata manu contra inimicos Dei volunt insurgere, et usque ad sepulchrum Domini ipso ducente pervenire.

assert against the latter his sovereign power. His uncertain political situation had procured admission for the remonstrances of his mother and other mediators, but after he had conquered Saxony these restraints vanished away. The pope heard that the emperor continued, in an arbitrary manner, to fill vacant bishoprics in Italy and Germany, and that he had again drawn around him the excommunicated ministers. After Gregory found that he had been deceived by many of Henry's specious words, he wrote him in the year 1075, as the last trial of kindness, a threatening letter, couched in language of paternal severity, but at the same time tempered with gentleness. The spirit in which he wrote was expressed already in the superscription:\* "Gregory to king Henry, health and apostolical blessing; that is, in case he obeys the apostolical see, as becomes a Christian prince." With such a proviso—the letter began—had he bestowed on him the apostolical blessing, because the report was abroad that he knowingly held fellowship with persons excommunicated. If this were the case, he himself must perceive that he could not otherwise expect to share the divine and apostolical blessing than that he separated himself from the excommunicated, inciting them to repentance, and rendered himself worthy of absolution by affording the satisfaction that was due. If, therefore, he felt himself to be guilty in this matter, he should quickly apply for advice to some pious bishop, confess his fault to him; and the bishop, with the concurrence of the pope, could impose a suitable penance, and bestow absolution on him.† He next complains of the contradiction between his fair professions and his actions. In reference to the law against investiture, concerning which the pope had been informed that the king had many difficulties,‡ he declared, it is true, once more, that he had merely restored the old ecclesiastical laws to their rights; yet he professed himself ready to enter into negotiations on that subject, § through pious men, with the king, and § to

\* Lib. III. ep. 10.

† Qui cum nostra licentia congruam tibi pro hac culpa injungens pœnitentiam te absolvat, ut nobis tuo consensu modum pœnitentiæ tuæ per epistolam suam veraciter intimare audeat.

‡ Decretum, quod quidam dicunt importabile pondus et immensam gravitudinem.

§ Ne pravi consuetudinis mutatio te commoveret.



mitigate so far the severity of the law in compliance with their advice, as could be done consistently with the glory of God and the spiritual safety of the king.

The pope had said nothing in this letter, which, according to his mode of looking at things, could offend the king's dignity. He looked upon it as a principle universally valid, that high and low should in like manner be subject to his spiritual jurisdiction. He could not foresee that Henry, after having so shortly before, at least in his professions, acknowledged so entire a submission to the papal see, would receive such a letter, in which he himself held out his hand for peace, with such violent indignation.\* But as appears evident from the

\* According to the account of the German historian, Lambert of Aschaffenburg, there was, to be sure, something else of a special character, which so exasperated the feelings of the king towards the pope, and which had in some sense compelled him, unless he was willing to be completely humbled before the pope, to anticipate the blow which he was to receive from Rome. The pope had sent an embassy to him, through which he cited him to appear before the Roman synod of Lent, on the Monday of the second week of Lent, A.D. 1076, where he was to clear himself of the charges which had been brought against him, with the threat that, if he did not comply, the ban would be pronounced on him the same day. The above-mentioned letter of the pope, however, contradicts the supposition of any such embassy. Some important occurrence must have intervened, which led the pope to deviate so far from the paternal tone which he had expressed in this letter. The thing, after all, remains quite improbable. We may perhaps consider the embassy mentioned by this historian as the same with that which was the bearer of the above-mentioned letter; and in this case, we must explain the contents of the message delivered by this embassy in accordance with the letter itself. From the letter it follows, to be sure, that if Henry did not act in the way required of him by the pope, he had to expect excommunication; and from this the story just related may have grown. Were the statement, as we find it given by this historian, the correct one, the defenders of Gregory could never have appealed to the fact, that Henry had attacked the pope without any previous provocation, and that this first violent step was the source of all the ensuing evil. Thus, the language of Gebhard, bishop of Salzburg, to Hermann, bishop of Metz, is: "The adherents of Henry could not excuse themselves on the ground that they at first had only adopted measures of defence against the pope." *Nam apostolicæ animadversionis, qua se injuriatos causantur, ipsi potius causa extiterunt, et unde se accensos conqueruntur, hoc ipsi potius incendunt ideoque injurias non tam retulerunt quam intulerunt. Cum enim primum ad initiandam hanc rem Wormatiæ confluxissent, ubi omnis, quam patimur, calamitas exordium sumpsit, nullam adhuc Dominus Papa excommunicationis vel anathematis sententiam destinavit. sed ipsi, primitiæ discordiarum, ipso ignorante et nihil minus putante, prælationi suæ*

letter of the pope addressed to the Germans themselves,\* he afterwards sent to him three men, natives of countries subject to the emperor, who were directed privately to reprove him for his transgressions, exhort him to repentance, and represent to him, that if he did not reform, and shun all intercourse with the excommunicated, he might expect excommunication; and that then, as a thing which, according to the Hildebrandian notions of ecclesiastical law, followed necessarily upon excommunication, he would no longer be competent to administer the government. Henry, in his existing state of mind, was little capable of enduring such a mode of treatment as this. He dismissed the envoys in an insulting manner; and an accidental circumstance contributed perhaps to induce him to venture on a step which was by no means justified in the then existing forms of law, but by which he hoped he might be able to rid himself at once of so annoying an overseer. A certain cardinal, Hugo Blancus, whom pope Alexander the Second, and indeed Gregory himself, had employed on embassies, but who for reasons unknown had become the pope's most bitter enemy, and whom Hildebrand had deposed,† came to the emperor, and handed over to him a violent complaint against the pope. The king now issued letters missive for an assembly of his spiritual and secular dignitaries, to be held at Worms on the Sunday of *Septuagesima*, A.D. 1076. These letters invited them to come to the rescue, not merely of his own insulted dignity, but also of the interest of all the bishops, the interests of the whole oppressed church. In this writing he even accuses the pope, probably on the ground of the

superba et repentina temeritate abrenuntiaverunt. Gebhard then seeks to prove this by the chronology of events. When Henry celebrated the festival of St. Andrew in Bamberg, shortly before Christmas, there was still so good an understanding between the emperor and the pope, that the former acted entirely according to the determinations of the latter in displacing the bishop of Bamberg. Quid ergo tam cito intercidere potuit, ut ille, qui in proximo ante nativitatem Domini tantæ in ecclesia magnificentiae fuit, ut ad nutum illius dignitatum mutationes fierent, idem paucis post nativitatem diebus inconventus, inauditus totius etiam ignarus dissensionis proscriberetur? Ed. Tengenagel, pp. 28, 29.

\* Præterea misimus ad eum tres religiosos viros, suos utique fideles, per quos eum secreto monuimus, ut pœnitentiam ageret de suis sceleribus.

† Lambert says: Quem ante paucos dies propter ineptiam et mores inconditos papa de statione sua amoverat.

above-mentioned rumour, of having obtained possession of the papal dignity in an unlawful manner.\* He requires of the bishops, that they should stand by him in a distress, which was not his alone, but the common distress of all the bishops, and of the whole oppressed church. It was the common interest of the empire and of the priesthood; for the pope had, notwithstanding Christ's direction that the two swords, the spiritual and the secular, the two powers,† should be separated from each other, sought to usurp both for himself. He meant to let no man be a priest who did not sue for it at his own footstool; and because the king regarded his royal power as received solely from God, and not from the pope, he had threatened to deprive him of his government and of his soul's salvation.

The council, which met on the Sunday of *Septuagesima*, January 24, 1076, on the ground of the charges brought against the pope by the cardinal Hugo Blancus, pronounced sentence of deposition upon Gregory; and, which shows to what extent these bishops and abbots were willing to be employed as the blind tools of power, and how much they needed a severe regent at the head of the church, notwithstanding the irregular procedure of this assembly, notwithstanding the scruples which, according to the ecclesiastical views of that period, must have arisen against it in the minds of the clergy, not a man amongst them all uttered a word against it. Two only, Adalbero bishop of Würzburg, and Hermann bishop of Metz, protested against the irregularity of this proceeding. They objected to it, in the first place, on the general principle, that no bishop, without a previous regular trial, without the proper accusers and witnesses, and without proof of the charges brought against him, could be deposed; and least of all could this be done in the case of the pope, against whom no bishop or archbishop could appear as an accuser.

It was considered a duty of loyalty to the king to acquiesce in this decision. In order to bind the members of the assembly, Henry caused a written oath to be taken by each, that he would

\* *Invasoris violentia.*

† Concerning the spiritual sword, it is said that, by means of it, men were to be compelled to obey the king next to God. The pope, therefore, ought to unite with the king in punishing those who disobeyed the latter. *Videlicet sacerdotali gladio ad obedientiam regis post Dominum homines constringendos.*

no longer recognize Gregory as pope. This judgment having been passed, Henry announced it to the pope in a letter, addressed as follows: "Henry, king by the grace of God and not by the will of man, to Hildebrand, no longer apostolical, but a false monk:" and the letter concluded with the words—"this sentence of condemnation having been pronounced upon you by us and all our bishops, descend from the apostolical chair you have usurped; let another mount the chair of Peter, who will not cloak deeds of violence under religion, but set forth the sound doctrines of St. Peter. I, Henry, and all our bishops, bid you come down, come down." Moreover, in this letter, it was alleged against the pope, that he had attacked the divine right by which kings are appointed, and that he sought to degrade all prelates to the position of his servants, *and stirred up the people against the clergy.\** At the same time, Henry addressed a letter to the cardinals and to the Roman people, calling upon them to acquiesce in this sentence, and to sustain the election of a new pope. An ecclesiastic of Parma, by the name of Roland,† was selected to convey these letters to Rome, and to announce to the pope the judgment passed upon him.

Shortly before this storm came upon the pope, he had been delivered from a great danger, which gave him another opportunity of showing his unconquerable fortitude. It was an after-effect of that wild, lawless condition which had prevailed at Rome in the eleventh century (and to which an end was put by the popes who ruled in the spirit of Hildebrand), that Cinti-  
tius, a Roman nobleman of licentious morals, one who indulged himself in the most extravagant actions and patronized the lowest crimes, was permitted to occupy a strong citadel built in the heart of the city, thus exercising a lordship of the very worst character. As Gregory would not tolerate such a person, and his firm will threatened to ruin this man's power, the latter determined to get rid of him by a conspiracy which he formed with Gregory's numerous enemies. The vigils in the

\* *Rectores ecclesiæ sicut servos sub pedibus tuis calcasti, in quorum conculcatione tibi favorem ab ore vulgi comparasti. Laicis ministerium super sacerdotes usurpasti, ut ipsi deponant vel contemnant, quos ipsi a manu Dei per impositionem manuum episcopaliū docendi acceperant.*

† By others called Eberhard.

night before Christmas, A. D. 1075, was the time selected for the deed. At the public service, Gregory was fallen upon and hurried away, wounded, to a tower in Cintius's castle. He remained calm and firm in the midst of all these insults, and in the face of danger; not a word of complaint or of supplication fell from his lips. There was displayed on this occasion, too, a beautiful proof of the enthusiastic regard which Gregory had inspired towards himself in the more serious minds. A man and a woman, both of high rank, insisted on attending the pope in his confinement; the man endeavoured to keep him warm with furs during the cold winter night; the woman bound up his wound. When, however, the next morning, Gregory's absence was observed, the most violent commotions broke out among the people. The citadel of Cintius was stormed; he saw himself compelled to give the pope his freedom, and it was by means of the latter alone, his life was saved from the fury of the people.

As Gregory was about to open the Lent-synod, in the year 1076, the above-mentioned Roland appeared, and, in the name of king Henry and the synod of Worms, announced the judgment which had there been passed. There arose a common feeling of bitter indignation, to which he would have fallen a victim, had not Gregory interposed and saved him.\* The pope calmly heard all: without betraying the least agitation, he held a discourse, in which he distinctly set forth that men ought not to be surprised at these contests, foretold by Christ; he declared himself resolved to suffer anything for the cause of God, and exhorted the cardinals to do the same. Then he pronounced, in the name of the apostle, the ban on king Henry: declared him (which was the natural consequence of this act, according to his theory of ecclesiastical law) incompetent to reign any longer, and forbade his subjects to obey him for the

\* We doubtless have the words of an eye-witness in the chronicle of Bernold of Constance: *Quid ibi tumultus et conclamationis et in legatos illos non ordinatæ incursionis excreverit, noverint illi, qui præsto fuerunt. Hoc unum sit nostrum inde dixisse, dominum apostolicum non sine sui ipsius corporis magno satis periculo, quancquam vix, eos Romanorum manibus semivivos eripuisse.* Monumenta res Allemannicas illustrantia ed. S. Blas. a. 1792, T. II. p. 30. That violent enemy of the pope's, the princess Anna Comnena, unjustly accuses Gregory himself of having treated the ambassadors in a shameful and abusive manner. In Alexias, l. 13.

future. He pronounced, also, sentence of excommunication on the bishops from whom everything had proceeded in that assembly at Worms. He announced the same punishment as awaiting the archbishop Sigfrid of Mentz, William of Utrecht, and Rupert of Bamberg, unless they should come to Rome and justify their conduct.

This sentence pronounced by the pope was the signal for a violent and long-continued contest between the two parties, who fought each other both with the sword and with arguments. The men who were zealous for the cause of Henry insisted on the sacredness of the oath, whose binding force no authority could destroy. They called it, therefore, an act of consummate wickedness, that a pope, setting himself above all laws, human and divine, should have presumed to discharge subjects from their sworn obligations towards their princes. They also considered the power of princes as one founded in a divine order, and subsisting independently by itself; they appealed to the duties inculcated in the New Testament, of obedience to those in authority, and would concede to no power on earth the right of annulling this obligation. They appealed to the fact, that the apostles had shown obedience even to pagan magistrates, and recommended such obedience: that the more ancient bishops and popes had never entertained a thought of deposing even idolatrous and heretical princes.\* The fulmination of the papal ban, it was said, does

\* So said the scholastic writer Guenrich, standing at this point of view, in the name of bishop Theodoric of Verdun, when these disputes had already lasted for some time. Martene et Durand thesaurus novus anecdotorum, T. I. Non est novum, homines seculares seculariter sapere et agere, novum est autem et omnibus retro seculis inauditum, pontifices regna gentium tam facile velle dividere. Nomen regum inter ipsa mundi initia repertum adeo postea stabilitum repentina factione elidere, Christos Dei, quoties liberit plebejos sorte sicuti villicos mutare, regno patrum suorum decedere jussos, nisi confestim acquieverint, anathemati damnare. The author of this letter appeals to the precepts of the apostle Paul concerning duties to magistrates: Porro de ordinatis a Deo potestatibus omni studio suscipiendis, omni amore diligendis, omni honore reverendis, omni patientia tolerandis tanta ubique sapientia disputat. Concerning the indissoluble obligation of an oath, it is here said: Sanctam et omnibus retro seculis apud omnium gentium nationes inviolatam jurisjurandi religionem facillima, inquit, domini papæ rescindit absolutio, et quod tantum est, ut illud omnis controversiæ finem apostolus nominaret. Hebr. vi. 16, modo unius cartulæ per quemlibet bajulatorem porrectæ levissima infringere juberetur lectione.

not carry with it so much danger as it does fright. Human affairs would be in truly a sad condition if the wrath of God followed every ebullition of human passion.\* An unjust ban fell back upon the head of its author. The other party agreed, it is true, with all that was said with regard to the sanctity of an oath; but they maintained that an oath taken in reference to anything at variance with the divine law could have no binding force. No oath given to the prince, therefore, could obligate subjects to obey him in setting himself up against the one to whom is committed, by God, the guidance of entire Christendom.† If he who has been expelled from the fellowship of the church became, by that very circumstance, incapable of administering any civil office, and if any man who continued to have fellowship with him thereby procured his own expulsion from the church-community; if the pope, as the director of entire Christendom, might call to account all the rulers of the earth in case they abused their authority, might bring them to punishment, and depose them from office,‡ then it followed, as a matter of course, that to the king, on whom the pope had passed such a judgment, lawful obedience could no longer be rendered. The oath, moreover, by which the bishops bound themselves, before their consecration, to obey the pope, was contrary to the oath of homage given to the prince.§ And when some appealed to the in-

\* In the letter already cited: *Hoc tonitruum non tantum portendit periculum, quantum intendit terroris. Male profecto rebus humanis consultum esset, si ad qualescunque animi concitati motus divina sequeretur damnatio, sicut illi uniuscujusque iracundia dictare vellet, qui omnia dispensat, in mensura, et pondere et numero.*

† Thus archbishop Gebhard of Salzburg, in his letter written to bishop Hermann of Metz, in defence of the cause of Gregory the Seventh. It is here objected to the opposite party, that they brought forward such remarks as the following: *ad percutiendam simpliciorum fratrum infirmam conscientiam, quatenus eis sub specie pietatis laqueum injiciant et quasi vera dicendo fallant, diligentius autem intuentibus ad nostræ controversiæ causæ nihil pertinere videntur. Nam quis sanæ mentis perjurium grave peccatum esse dubitet?* But from this, he says, it does not follow, *ut quicquid quisque juret, indifferenter et sine retractatione servandum sit.*

‡ Thus, too, writes Gerhoh of Reichersberg: *Ordo clericalis cujus nimirum est officium, non solum plebejos, sed etiam reges increpare atque regibus aliis descendentibus, alios ordinare.* L. c. in Ps. xxix. f. 636.

§ *Credimus enim, memoriæ illorum non excidisse, quod in sacro illo*

violable divine right of kings, the other party maintained, on the other hand, that it was necessary to distinguish between the rightful authority of princes and the abuse of arbitrary will, between kings and tyrants. Princes deprived themselves of their own authority by abusing it.\*

No impression could be made on pope Gregory by the doubts expressed respecting the lawfulness of his conduct by Hermann, bishop of Metz.† In the light of the principles which he maintained, it appeared to him a thing absolutely settled that the pope might excommunicate a king, like any other mortal; and any doubt expressed on this point he could only look upon as a mark of incredible fatuity.‡ He appealed to the example of pope Zacharias, who pronounced sentence of deposition upon the last of the Merovingians, and absolved the Franks from their oath of allegiance to him; to the example of bishop Ambrose of Milan, who in fact excommunicated an emperor. He asked whether Christ, when he committed to Peter the feeding of his sheep, the power to bind and to loose, made any exception in favour of princes. If kings could not be excommunicated by the church, it would follow, that neither could they receive absolution from the church. But to this bishop Waltram of Naumburg, not without reason, replied, that Ambrose had, it is true, once excluded the emperor Theodosius from the communion of the church, which was attended with the most salutary consequences both to that emperor and to the common weal; but he had not the remotest intention or wish to disturb thereby the relation subsisting between the emperor and his subjects. He had rendered to God the things that are God's, and to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's. Even towards Valentinian the Second and his mother Justina, Ambrose had never, in all the disputes with

episcoporum et cleri conventu ad promerendam promotionem suam beato Petro suisque vicariis et successoribus fidem et subjectionem se servaturos promiserunt. Quomodo ergo hoc pluris faciunt, quod in cubiculo sive in aula regis inter Palatinos strepitus conspiraverunt, quam illud, quod eorum sacro altari sanctisque sanctorum reliquiis sub testimonia Christi et ecclesiæ professi sunt?

\* So says Bernold of Constance, l. c. p. 57: Recte faciendo nomen regis tenetur, alioquin amittitur, unde est hoc vetus elogium: rex eris, si recte facis, si non facis, non eris.

† See Gregory's letters, l. IV. ep. 2.

‡ Licet pro magna fatuitate nec etiam iis respondere debeamus.



them, taken any such liberties.\* His reasoning is not so strong with regard to the other example, of pope Zacharias. He says, the pope did not by any means depose Childeric, nor absolve his subjects from their oath of allegiance to him; for Childeric merely bore the *name* of king, without possessing the kingly power. Of the latter, therefore, he did not need to be deprived.†

Yet the ban pronounced by the pope produced a great effect in Germany, which was increased by the prevailing dissatisfaction with Henry's government. The bishop Udo of Triers, after his return from Rome, avoided all intercourse with the spiritual and secular counsellors of the emperor who had been excommunicated by the pope. He declared, that by holding fellowship with the excommunicated king, one became involved in the same condition; that only at his special request permission had been granted him by the pope of conversing with the king; yet even to him the communion of prayer and of the Lord's table with that monarch had been forbidden. By the example and the representations of Udo, many were induced to draw away from the king. But the men of the other party sought by the arguments above mentioned to confirm the king in his resistance to the pope; they maintained that an arbitrary unjust ban ought not to be feared; that in such a case religion was only employed as a pretext to cover private passions and private ends. They called upon him to use the sword which God had intrusted to him, as the legitimate sovereign, for the punishment of evil doers against the enemies of the empire. Such language found a ready ear on the part of the king. He was inclined already to bid defiance to the papal ban, and to threaten with his kingly authority those who sided with the pope's party; but as the

\* See Waltram Naumburgens. de unitate eccles. et imperii, L. I. p. 66. Sed ipse quoque sanctus Ambrosius ecclesiam non divisit, sed ea, quæ Cæsaris sunt, Cæsari et quæ Dei, Deo reddenda esse docuit, qui Theodosium ecclesiastica coercuit disciplina, etc. Ecce illa excommunicatio quam utilis erat ecclesiæ pariter atque ipsi imperatori Theodosio, quæ nunc prodendi schismatis ponitur exemplo, quo separentur principes, vel milites reipublicæ ab imperatoris sui consortio simul et obsequio!

† Lib. I. p. 17. Quandoquidem ille Hilderichus nihil omnino regię potestatis vel dignitatis habuisse describatur, atque ideo comprobatur, quod non fuerit dominus aliquorum sive rector, quoniam rex a regendo dicitur.

number of those who went over to that party was constantly increasing, and he wanted power to carry his threats into execution, he suddenly adopted quite another tone. He sought to bend the minds of his opponents by negotiations, but this also proved fruitless, and they were already on the point of proceeding to the extremest measures.

In the year 1076 the Suabian and Saxon princes assembled at Tribur. Before this assembly appeared, as papal legates, the patriarch Sighard of Aquileia, and the bishop Altmann of Passau, a man eminently distinguished for his strict piety. And here we may notice how large a party stood up for the pope from among those who felt a serious regard for religion. Several laymen, who had renounced important stations and great wealth for the purpose of devoting themselves to a strictly ascetic life, now appeared publicly as advocates of the papal principles. These refused to hold communion with any one who maintained familiar intercourse with king Henry, after his excommunication, till each had personally obtained absolution from bishop Altmann, the prelate empowered by the pope to bestow it. After a deliberation of seven days, it was resolved to proceed to the election of a new king. Henry, after a variety of fruitless negotiations with the opposite party, among whom partly the political partly the religious interest predominated, determined to give way. An agreement was entered into, to the effect that the pope should be invited to visit Augsburg on the festival of the purification of Mary; there, in a numerous assembly of the princes, all accusations against the king should be presented, and then, after the pope had heard what both parties had to say, the decision should be left with him. If the king, by any fault of his own, remained excommunicated a year, he should be considered for ever incapable of holding the government: in the mean time he should abstain from all intercourse with the excommunicated, and live in Speier as a private man. Henry the Fourth agreed to all the conditions proposed to him, severe as they were; and as everything was now depending on his being absolved from the papal ban, in order that he might be able to negotiate on equal footing with the princes, so he determined to pay a visit to the pope himself, in Italy, before the latter could come to Germany. He was willing to risk everything to obtain absolution.

A few days previous to Christmas, in the unusually cold winter of 1076-77, he crossed the Alps with his wife and little son, attended only by one individual, of no rank. Meantime the ambassadors of the German princes had come to the pope, and, in compliance with their invitation, the latter set out on his journey, expecting to reach Augsburg at the appointed time, on the 2nd of February, 1077,\* although his friends advised him not to undertake this journey, probably because they feared the power of Gregory's enemies in Italy. It had been agreed upon that, at a particular point of time, delegates from the princes should meet him on the borders of Italy, for the purpose of escorting him to Augsburg. Twenty days before the time appointed, the pope set out on his journey. Meanwhile came also the messengers of king Henry, through whom the latter promised him every satisfaction and amendment, and urgently begged for absolution. Gregory, however, would not meddle with the matter; he only loaded him with severe reproaches for his transgressions.†

If, viewing the matter in the light of the pope's rigidly consistent system, we might perhaps approve of Gregory's conduct towards the *insolent* Henry, yet we cannot fail to miss, in his conduct towards the *humbled* man, that spirit of love which proceeds from a pure gospel; we perceive in it nothing but the stiff firmness of a self-will, which, spurning all human feelings, goes straight onward to the mark on which it has once fixed.

The promised escort from Germany found it impossible, on account of the many difficulties they met with, to make their appearance at the time appointed; and Gregory's journey to Germany was hindered by various circumstances. Meanwhile Henry arrived in Italy, and the reception he there met with stood in melancholy contrast with his actual situation. A large party exulted at his appearance; the numerous oppo-

\* It is evident from the words of Gregory himself, in his letter to the Germans, Mansi. XX. f. 386, that this was the reason of his undertaking the journey to Lombardy. The account given by Domnizo, in his *Life of Mathilda*, at the beginning of the second book, is false therefore; namely, that Gregory came to Lombardy at the request of the latter, who stood forth as mediator between the king and the pope.

† Gregory himself says: "Acriter enim de suis excessibus per omnes, qui intercurrerant, nuncios redarguimus."

ments of Gregory, among the bishops and nobles, hoped to gain in the king a head to their party, and they were ready to do anything in his service. Gregory, being fully aware of the fickle-mindedness of the young king, felt uncertain whether such a reception would not produce a change in his disposition and his mode of procedure. In this uncertainty with regard to his own situation, he betook himself for a while to the castle of his enthusiastically devoted friend, the powerful Margravine Mathilda of Tuscany.\*

But Henry, for the present, had no other object in view than to get himself absolved from the ban. Before him went

\* The connection of the pope with this lady was certainly of the purest character; and so it appears in his correspondence with her. The enthusiastic devotedness of the most strict and pious persons of the age testifies in favour of Gregory. The accusations of his most violent enemies, who brought so many absurd charges against him, certainly cannot be regarded as trustworthy evidence. It was natural that they should avail themselves of this connection of Gregory, for the purpose of throwing suspicion on the character of this severe censor of the morals of the clergy with regard to this very point, and thereby to place his zeal for the laws of the celibacy of priests in an unfavourable point of light. That fierce opponent of the Hildebrandian party, bishop Waltram of Naumburg, intimates this suspicion against the pope, however, in such a way, that it is easy to see how little reason he himself had for regarding it as well-grounded. *Apolog. l. II. c. 36.* Mathilda illa post octavum quoque annum, quo defunctus est Hildebrand familiaris ejus, defendit promptissime contra sedem apostolicam (Guibert's party) et contra imperatorem partem ipsius, qui propter frequens cum ea et familiare colloquium generavit plurimis scævæ suspicionis scandalum. Henry, bishop of Speier, expresses himself in stronger terms, in his invective against Gregory, *Eccard. T. II.* in the collection of letters of the *Cod. Bamberg. ep. 162*: Qui etiam quasi fœtore quodam gravissimi scandalî totam ecclesiâ repleti de convitu et cohabitatione alienæ mulieris familiariori, quam necesse sit. In qua re verecundia nostra magis quam causa laborat, quum hæc generalis querela unicuique personuerit, omnia judicia, omnia decreta per feminas in sede apostolica actitari, denique per feminas totum orbem ecclesiæ administrari. The impartial Lambert of Aschlaffenburg remarks, concerning the relation of Mathilda to the pope: Tanquam patri vel domino sedulum exhibebat officium. He then refers to the misinterpretations put on this relation, which proceeded from the friends of Henry, and particularly from the opponents of the laws of celibacy among the clergy, and says of these: Sed apud omnes sanum aliquid sapientes luce clarius constabat, falsa esse, quæ dicebantur. Nam et papa tam eximie tamque apostolice vitam instituebat, ut nec minimam sinistri rumoris maculam conversationis ejus, sublimitas admitteret et illa in urbe celeberrima atque in tanta obsequentium frequentia, obscœnum aliquid perpetrans latere nequaquam potuisset.

the excommunicated bishops and nobles of Germany, in the habit of penitents, barefoot and in woollen garments, to beg absolution from the pope. The latter listened, it is true, to their petition, but he required of them such proofs of their repentance as would be calculated to leave a right lasting impression on men so inured to luxury. Each of the bishops was obliged to remain from morn to evening shut up in a solitary cell, in his penitential raiment, partaking only of the most meagre diet. Then he allowed them to come before him and gave them absolution, after mildly reproving them for their transgressions, and exhorting them to guard against such conduct for the future. When they took their leave of him, he strictly charged them to abstain from all fellowship with king Henry till he had become reconciled with the church; only for the purpose of exhorting him to repentance, they might be allowed to converse with him.

But Gregory proceeded more harshly with the young king himself. First he repelled the urgent entreaties of that prince, and the intercessions of Mathildis, of the abbot Hugo of Cluny (who was the king's godfather), and of many others who implored his compassion on the young monarch. He says himself, in his letter to the Germans:—"All were surprised at his unusual severity, and many imagined they perceived in it a tyrannical cruelty."\* He persisted in requiring that everything should be referred over to the trial which was to be instituted at the appointed convention in Germany. At length he yielded to the entreaties and intercessions poured in upon him, but required of king Henry still severer proofs of his repentance than he had demanded from those bishops. The king, after having laid aside all the insignia of his imperial rank, and clothed himself in the garb of a penitent, was admitted into the sacred inclosure of the castle of Canossa, where he waited fasting, during three days, in the rough winter at the commencement of the year 1077, till a length, on the fourth day, the pope admitted him to his presence. He gave him absolution under the condition that he should appear be-

\* *Ut pro eo multis precibus et lacrimis intercedentibus, omnes quidem insolitam mentis nostræ duritiam mirarentur, nonnulli vero in nobis non apostolicæ severitatis gravitatem, sed quasi tyrannicæ feritatis crudelitatem esse clamarent.*

fore the proposed general assembly in Germany, where the pope would listen to the accusations of his adversaries, and to what he had to say in defence of himself, and give his decision accordingly. Till then he should utterly renounce the government, and, if he obtained it again, bind himself to support the pope in everything requisite for the maintenance of the ecclesiastical laws. If he failed to observe this condition, he should again fall under the ban.\* And the abbot Hugo of Cluny, and several persons present, of the spiritual and secular orders, pledged themselves that the king would fulfil the conditions of the compact. The pope then celebrated the mass in the presence of the king and of a numerous multitude. When he had consecrated the host, he observed, while taking a portion of it, that he had been accused by his enemies in Germany of many offences. True, he could bring forward many witnesses of his innocence, but he chose rather to appeal to the testimony of God than to that of man; and for the purpose of refuting, in the shortest way, all those charges, he here called on God himself to witness his innocence, while he now took, in averring it, the body of the Lord. Let Almighty God now declare him free, if he was innocent, or cause the partaking of the body of Christ to prove his immediate destruction, if he was guilty. Gregory regarded this, like his contemporaries, as a judgment of God; and such an appeal to the divine decision by a miracle was in perfect harmony with his whole mode of thinking. With the greatest composure he partook of the holy supper, which to him—since, according to his own religious conviction, this was really subjecting himself to a judgment of God—would have been impossible, if in his conscience he had felt that he was guilty. In very deed, therefore, it was the testimony of a tranquil conscience, and on the assembled multitude (to whom this appeared as such a triumph of innocence as if the voice of God had spoken directly from heaven) it must have made a most powerful impression. With a loud shout of approbation it was accepted

\* In his letter to the Germans, Gregory appeals also to the fact that everything was still undecided; that he was bound by no obligation to the king: *adhuc totius negotii causa suspensa est. Scitis nos non aliter regi obligatos esse, nisi quod puro sermone sicut nobis mos est ea diximus, quibus eum ad salutem et honorem suum aut cum iustitia aut cum misericordia sine nostræ aut illius animæ periculo adjuvare possimus.*

by the whole assembly ; and praise to the God, who had so glorified innocence, rung out from every mouth. When the shouts of the multitude had somewhat abated, the pope turned with the remainder of the host to the young king, and invited him to attest his innocence of all the charges brought against him from Germany, by doing the same. Then there would be no occasion for the trial which it had been proposed to hold in Germany, for all human judicatories were liable to error, and then he himself would, from that moment, stand forth as Henry's defender. But Henry was neither sufficiently sure of his own innocence, nor sufficiently hardened against religious impressions, to subject himself, uncertain of the result, to such an ordeal. He turned pale at the proposal, whispered with his attendants, sought evasions, and finally requested the pope to leave everything to be decided by the trial to be had in Germany. He pledged himself, by oath, to refer the settlement of the disputes in Germany to the pope's decision, and to insure his safety, so far as it depended on himself, in his journey to Germany. At the close of the service, Gregory invited him to a repast, conversed with him in a friendly manner, and then dismissed him with serious admonitions.

The question here arises, whether the pope was perfectly sincere in effecting this reconciliation with king Henry. The enemies of Gregory charge him \* with having persecuted him from the beginning, on a calculated plan of bringing about his utter ruin, and of using everything as a means to accomplish this end. If Henry obeyed, and refrained entirely from exercising his kingly authority till that assembly could meet in Germany, then he would, by that very act, render himself contemptible ; while the power of the anti-emperor, about whose election men were already busying themselves, would become more and more confirmed ; or if he did not fulfil the condition, an opportunity would be given the pope to accuse him of violating the agreement, and again to pronounce the ban upon him. In what light would Gregory, with this fine-spun plan of revenge, requiring him to turn the most sacred acts into a means of deception, have to be regarded ? If, after having granted king Henry absolution, he had still been able

\* So bishop Waltram of Naumburg, in his work *De unitate ecclesiæ et imperii*, L. I. c. vi.

to say to the enemies of that monarch, who were dissatisfied with this step, as he is represented to have said in a letter, that "they should give themselves no trouble about what he had done, he was only going to send them back Henry loaded with deeper guilt,"\* what diabolical malice and hypocrisy! Well might Waltram of Naumburg say, "He dismissed him in peace, but peace such as Judas pretended, not such as Christ bestowed."† With perfect justice might he exclaim, in view of such an act of duplicity, "This is not acting like a successor of Peter; this is not feeding Christ's sheep, to send one away loaded with still heavier guilt, and one too who repented of his fault; this was not acting like a priest of our Lord, who himself says in the gospel, that in heaven there is more joy over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just men that need no repentance."‡

But we are listening to the words of a passionate antagonist. The language of party-passion, on either side, is to be heard with distrust. Who could penetrate into Gregory's heart, so as to be sure of the disposition in which he acted? The reasoning from an actual result to a deliberate purpose is always most unsafe. Even though Gregory had said what is laid to his charge, or something like it, still a great deal depends on the question, in what connection he said it, and whether with some condition or in an unconditioned manner. The dignity and self-respect which Gregory ever exhibits in his public communications, render it extremely unlikely that he would suffer himself to be hurried by passion to utter words so much in contradiction with those qualities. In granting king Henry absolution, Gregory assuredly said nothing to him which could have been designed to deceive him; he gave him plainly enough to understand that all was depending on his future behaviour: he even persisted in declaring that the whole matter

\* Ne sitis solliciti, quoniam culpabiliorem eum reddo vobis.

† Concerning Henry: Dimissus est in pace, qualem scilicet pacem Judas simulavit; non qualem Christus reliquit.

‡ His words: Certe culpabiliorem facere aliquem, præcipue autem regem, quem præcipit Petrus apostolus honorificare, hoc non est oves Christi pascere. Culpabiliorem, inquam, facere, præcipue eum, quem pœniteat culpabilem existere, hoc non est, sacerdotem Domini esse, cum ipse in evangelio Dominus dicat, gaudium fieri in cælo super uno peccatore pœnitentiam agente, quam super nonaginta novem justis, qui non indigent pœnitentia.



was reserved for the trial which was to take place under his presidency in Germany—earlier than this, nothing was to be determined in relation to the settlement of the government.\* By *his own* judicial decision everything should be set to rights in Germany, and only in case he submitted wholly to this could Henry calculate on a lasting peace with the pope. As to the fact, therefore, the remarks of Waltram with regard to the precarious position of the emperor, however he might act, were correct; though it cannot be said of the pope that, from the first, he only became reconciled to Henry in appearance, and had nothing else in view than his utter destruction. He acted thus, impelled by that reckless and persevering resolution with which he followed out false principles: he sacrificed to his consistency the true interests of the misled king and the well-being of the German people. It must be owned, however, that it was Henry who, hurried on by the force of circumstances, *first* broke the terms of the treaty.

When he returned back to his friends, and with them repaired to the states of Lombardy, he found the tone of feeling there very much altered. Men were highly indignant at the manner in which he had been made to humble himself before the detested Gregory. They were upon the point of renouncing him; they were for nominating his son emperor, and with the latter marching straight to Rome. As then Henry had so many enemies in Germany, as he could not place any great reliance on the pope, and as he here found a considerable party who were willing to do anything for him if he would place himself in their hands, he now went over wholly to this side. He allied himself once more with Gregory's enemies, acted once more as monarch, and resumed once more the counsellors whom the pope had excommunicated. As the earlier-appointed assembly in Germany could not be holden, the states, dissatisfied with king Henry, appointed another assembly, to meet in the beginning of March, 1077, and invited the pope to be present for the purpose of restoring order and tranquillity to Germany; but this also was prevented

\* As he says in his letter, in which he reported to the Germans his transactions with Henry, ep. iv. 12. Ita adhuc totius negotii causa suspensa est, ut et adventus noster et consiliorum vestrorum unanimitas permaxime necessaria esse videantur. Comp. the remarks already quoted, p. 157, in the note.

by Gregory's detention in Italy. Gregory sent to Germany two legates, who reported to the assembly what causes had hindered him from coming to Germany, and left it to them to provide, as they deemed best, for the necessities of the empire. At this assembly Rudolph duke of Suabia was elected king in Henry's place. Although the pope was doubtless already resolved to renew the ban against Henry if the latter did not alter his conduct, yet he still passed no definitive sentence. He declared himself at first neutral between the two parties, and named both the princes kings in his letters, and reserved it to himself, when he should visit Germany, to decide which party had the right. Meanwhile, in Germany, much blood was shed on both sides; the two parties persecuted each other with unrelenting ferocity. State and church were rent in pieces by these quarrels, while Gregory quietly looked on, and by his ambiguous declarations and acts kept up the contest. He expressed his pain\* at seeing so many thousand Christians fall victims to temporal and eternal death through the pride of one man; at seeing the Christian religion and the Roman church thereby prostrated to the ground. He did not declare, however, whom he meant by this individual; he only called upon the Germans to renounce obedience to the proud man, who hindered him from coming to Germany; on the other hand to obey him who showed himself devoted to the apostolical see. The partisans of Rudolph fiercely reproached him with hindering, by this ambiguous conduct, the decision of a quarrel, into which they at least had suffered themselves to be drawn in obedience to the papal see, when on the other hand, by a distinct declaration, he could bring the matter to an end; but Gregory was not moved by this language to depart from his plan. He exhorted the Germans to fidelity, and testified his firmness by declaring himself resolved to abide unswervingly by the principles on which he had always acted, without regarding the voice of the multitude, by which king Henry was defended and he himself accused of harshness towards that prince.† When, however, in the year 1080, the weapons

\* Ep. 149, in Cod. Babenberg. Eccard. T. II. f. 151.

† Mansi Concil. VII. 3. Quotquot Latini sunt, omnes causam Henrici præter admodum paucos laudant ac defendunt et perniciæ duritiæ ac impietatis circa eum me redarguunt.

of Rudolph met with continual success, the pope finally, at a Roman synod, passed the definitive sentence. He pronounced anew the ban on king Henry, because by his means the assembly in Germany had been prevented from meeting, and he recognized Rudolph as emperor, sending him a crown, inscribed with a motto in correspondence with the principles of his consistent theocratical system, claiming to himself, as Peter's successor, full power and authority to decide the contest concerning the election of an emperor in Germany;\* but at the same time he gave him also to understand that he should not yield an iota of the law against investiture.

It was now however, for the first time, that Gregory's firmness was really to be put to the test; for as, in this same year, duke Rudolph lost his life in a battle on the Elster, although again victorious, so Henry saw himself no longer prevented from directing his course again to Italy. After sentence of deposition had already been passed, at a previous council of Mentz, by a small number of bishops of Henry's party, on Gregory the Seventh, the same thing was repeated by a more numerous assembly, held at Brixen, of those dissatisfied with the Hildebrandian principles of government from Italy and Germany. Characteristic of the spirit of this assembly are some of the charges brought against Gregory: that he boasted of being favoured with divine revelations; of possessing the gift of prophecy; that he was given to the interpretation of dreams; that he was a disciple of Berengar.† One of Gregory's opponents, Guibert archbishop of Ravenna, was chosen pope, under the name of Clement the Third; but this arbitrary proceeding appeared too much like a political movement to have the least influence on men's religious convictions. The free-minded bishop Dieteric of Verdun, rendered famous by

\* Inscription: "Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolpho." Plank, in his history of the papacy (II. 1, p. 198), says, certainly with injustice: "The pope, in this inscription, probably did not have half so much in his thoughts as was attributed to him in the issue." What we have said above concerning the principles of this pope, as they are made known to us in his letters, as well as what we know concerning the system of the entire party, proves beyond question that Gregory had actually in his mind all that these words literally contain.

† Catholicam atque apostolicam fidem de corpore et sanguine in questionem ponentem, hæretici Berengarii antiquum discipulum, divinationum et somniorum cultorem.

his fidelity to king Henry, had been induced to take a part in these proceedings of the above-mentioned assembly at Mentz ; but he soon repented of it, his conscience reproaching him for this step. He suddenly, and in a secret manner, forsook the assembly, and felt impelled to seek absolution from Gregory the Seventh, whom he recognized as the lawful pope.\*

King Henry himself felt a want of confidence in his cause. He gladly offered his hand for peace, and declared himself ready, before penetrating farther with his army into Italy, to enter into negotiations for that purpose with the pope; but the latter showed no disposition to yield anything, though his friends represented to him that all would go over to the side of the king in Italy, and that no help was to be expected from Germany. He replied that, for himself, it was not so very great a thing to be left destitute of all help from men.† He exhorted the Germans not to be in haste about the election of a new emperor after the death of Rudolph. He prescribed to the new king, without taking any notice of his own perilous situation, in an imperative tone, a form of oath drawn up in accordance with his theocratic system, whereby the king was to promise that he would faithfully observe, as became a genuine Christian, all that the pope should command in the name of true obedience,‡ and consecrate himself, as soon as he should have an opportunity of meeting him in person, a *miles sancti Petri et illius*.

It is deserving of notice that the pope, who had shown so much strictness in his judicial sentences against married priests, now yielded on this point, for the moment, to the force of circumstances; that because Henry's party gained an advantage from the prevailing dissatisfaction with the laws respecting

\* He writes about his participation in the above-mentioned convention : *Multipliciter coactus sum ibi agere contra ordinem, contra salutem meam, imo contra dignitatem ecclesiasticam, abrenuntiavi sedenti in sede apostolica, et hoc sine ratione aliqua, cum præsens non audiretur, auditus discuteretur, discussus convinceretur. Abrenuntiavi illi, cui in examine meæ ordinationis professus fueram obedientiam, cui subjectionem pollicitus eram, cui post b. Petrum suscepto regimine mihi commissæ ecclesiæ commissus fueram.*

† Quod (auxilium) si nobis, qui illius superbiam parvi pendimus, deficiat, non adeo grave videtur. Mansi Concil. IX. 3.

‡ Quodcumque mihi ipse papa præceperit, sub his videlicet verbis, per veram obedientiam, fideliter, sicut oportet Christianum, observabo.

celibacy, and because the deficiency of ecclesiastics who would have been competent, according to the rigid construction of those earlier laws respecting celibacy, to administer the sacraments, was too great, he deemed it best to recommend to his legates the exercise of indulgence in this matter till more quiet times.\*

The same inflexibility which Gregory opposed to king Henry, when that monarch was pressing towards Rome, he still maintained, when besieged during two years in Rome itself. No force could move him to enter into negotiations with the king, with whom, if he had been willing to crown him emperor, he might have concluded an advantageous peace. He despised the threats of the Romans. He chose rather, as he declared, to die as a martyr, than to swerve in the least from the strict line of justice.†

At length, in the year 1084, the Romans, tired of the siege, and discontented with the defiance of the pope, opened their gates to king Henry, and received him with demonstrations of joy, which he announced to his friends in Germany as a triumph bestowed by God himself.‡ Gregory was obliged to retreat into the castle of St. Angelo (*domum Crescentii*). The emperor gave orders for convoking a numerous public assembly, in which the sentence of deposition on Gregory and the election of Clement were confirmed.§ At the Easter

\* Lib. IX. ep. 3. Quod vero de sacerdotibus interrogastis, placet nobis, ut in præsentiarum tum propter populorum turbationes, tum etiam propter bonorum inopiam, scilicet quia paucissimi sunt, qui fidelibus officia religionis persolvant, pro tempore rigorem canonicum temperando debeat is sufferre.

† Lib. IX. ep. 11.

‡ Thus the emperor writes from Rome to Dieteric, bishop of Verdun: Incredibile videtur, quod verissimum probatur, quod factum est in Roma, ut ita dicam, cum decem hominibus in nobis operatus est Dominus, quod antecessores nostri si fecissent cum decem millibus, "miraculum esset omnibus.

§ The emperor writes, in the above-cited letter, after his departure from Rome: (Romani) summo triumpho et fide prosequuti sunt nos, in tantum ut in Domino fiducialiter dicamus, quia tota Roma in manu nostra est, excepto illo castello, in quo conclusus est Hildebrand, scilicet in domo Crescentii. Quem Hildebrandum legali omnium cardinalium (which certainly is exaggerated) ac totius populi Romani iudicio scias abjectum et electum papam nostrum Clementem in sede apostolica sublimatum omnium Romanorum acclamatione, nosque a papa Clemente

festival, the new pope, Clement, consecrated Henry emperor, and the latter soon departed from Rome. By the Norman duke, Robert Guiscard, Gregory was at length liberated from his confinement, and repaired to Cremona, where he soon after died, on the 25th of May, 1085. His last words are supposed to furnish evidence of his own conviction of the goodness of his cause; they were as follows: "I have loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."\* These words harmonize at least with the conviction which Gregory, in his letters, to the last moment of his life, expresses in the strongest language; and it will be much sooner believed that he sealed the consistency of his life with *such* words than that he testified on his death-bed, as another account reports,† his repentance at the controversy which he had excited, and recalled the sentence he had pronounced on his adversaries. At all events, we recognize in these two opposite accounts the mode of thinking which prevailed in the two hostile parties.

Under the name of this pope we have a number of brief maxims relating to the laws and government of the church, called his dictates (dictatus). Although these maxims did not by any means proceed from himself, still, they contain the principles which he sought to realize in his government of the church, the principles of papal absolutism,—signaling that new epoch in the history of the papacy which is to be attributed to him as the author, whereby everything was made to depend on the decision of the pope, and the jurisdiction over emperors and kings, as over all the presiding officers of the church, was placed in his hands. Most of these maxims may be confirmed by passages from his letters.

A contest like that between the emperor Henry and Gregory the Seventh could not be brought to a termination by the death of the latter; for although the quarrel had at length become a personal one, still there ever lay at bottom withal a conflict of opposite party tendencies and interests. Gregory

ordinatum et consensu omnium Romanorum consecratum in die s. Paschæ in imperatorem totius populi Romani. Gesta Trevirorum, ed. Wytttenbach et Mueller. Vol. I. p. 164, 1836.

\* Dilexi justitiam et odi iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio.

† By Sigebert of Gemblours, ad h. a.

was the hero and the saint of the party zealous for the system of the church theocracy. His death in misfortune appeared to that party a martyrdom for the holy cause.\* He had, moreover, for his successors, men whom he himself would have selected as like-minded with himself, and as persons of ability. After the first of these, Victor the Third (Gregory's enthusiastic admirer, the abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino), had died, A. D. 1087, Otto, bishop of Ostia, was chosen pope under the name of Urban the Second.

Though Urban was obliged to yield to the imperial party, which made their own pope, Clement, sovereign in Rome; still, events by which public opinion was gradually gained over to his side, were in his favour, so that, even when banished from the seat of the papacy, he was still enabled to exercise the most powerful influence. He could resume the position of a judge over princes; and the cause in which he did so was one where the pope could not fail to appear as the upholder of the authority of the divine law, and of the sacredness of the marriage covenant; and the light in which he here exhibited himself was necessarily reflected, greatly to his own advantage, on the whole relation in which he stood to his age. Philip, king of France, a prince accustomed to give free indulgence to his passions, in the year 1092, repudiated his lawful wife, Bertha, with the intention of marrying another, Bertrade, who had left her lawful husband, the count of Anjou. He found bishops cowardly and mean enough to serve as the instruments of his will; but the truly pious bishop Yves of Chartres, a prelate distinguished for the conscientious administration of his pastoral office, accustomed boldly to speak the truth to princes and popes, and zealous in contending for the purity of morals as well as the sacred tenure of the marriage covenant,† was of another mind. When invited to attend the king's wedding, he declared he could not consent to do so until, by a general assembly of the French church, the lawfulness of his separation from his first wife, and of the new marriage, had undergone a fair investiga-

\* Thus the abbot and cardinal Gottfried of Vendôme, in speaking of the opposition to lay investiture, says of Gregory the Seventh: "Qui pro defensione hujus fidei mortuus est in exilio." Ép. 7.

† See e. g. his letters, ed. Paris, 1610, ep. 5.

tion. "Whereas, I am formally summoned to Paris with your wife, concerning whom I know not whether she may be your wife," \* he wrote to the king, "therefore be assured, that for conscience' sake, which I must preserve pure in the sight of God, and for the sake of my good name, which the priest of Christ is bound to preserve towards those who are without, I would rather be sunk with a millstone in the depths of the sea than to be the means of giving offence to the souls of the weak. Nor does this stand in the least contradiction with the fidelity which I have vowed to you ; but I believe I shall best maintain that fidelity by speaking to you as I do, since I am convinced that for you to do as you propose, will bring great injury upon your soul, and great peril to your crown." Neither by threats and violence, nor by promises, could the pious man be turned in the least from the course which he considered right. He vehemently reproached those bishops who neglected their duty. The king's anger against him had for its consequence, that, by one of the nobles his property was confiscated, and he himself put under confinement. The first men of the City of Chartres now combined to procure the release of their bishop by force ; but he remonstrated in the strongest language against such a proceeding.† "By laying houses in ashes, and plundering the poor," he wrote to them, "ye cannot propitiate God's favour, but will only provoke his vengeance ; and without his favour neither can ye nor any man deliver me. I would not, therefore, that on my account ye should make the cry of the poor and the complaint of widows go up to God's ear. For neither is it befitting that I, who did not attain to the bishopric by warlike weapons, should recover it again by such means, which would not be the act of a shepherd, but of a robber. If the arm of the Lord has stricken me, and is still stretched out over me, then let me alone to bear my sorrow and the anger of the Lord, till he vindicates my cause ; and wish not to augment my misery by making others wretched, for I am determined not only to suffer incarceration or the deprivation of my ecclesiastical rank, but even to die, rather than that on my account one drop of blood should be spilt." He called upon laity and clergy, instead of attempting to effect his liberation by such

\* Ep. 15.

† Ep. 20.



means, simply to pray for him, for prayer had procured the deliverance of Peter, Acts xii. The king caused bishop Yves to be informed that he would forbear doing him a great harm, and on the other hand bestow on him great favours, if, by his intercession, he would obtain leave for him to retain Berthrade a short time longer; but Yves repelled the proposition with horror, saying, that neither bribes nor deception could blot out any man's sin, while he resolved to persist in it.\* He who resolved to persist in sin, could not redeem himself from its guilt by alms or gifts.† There was no help for the king, except by abstaining from his sin, and submitting himself by repentance to the yoke of Christ; for God did not require men's possessions, but themselves, as an offering in order to their salvation.‡ While Yves rejected all forcible, he employed every lawful means which the existing constitution of the church put into his hands, to procure victory to the side of the righteous cause. He applied to pope Urban the Second, and was strongly supported by him. This pontiff addressed a severe letter of reproof to the French bishops who had suffered themselves to be used as mere instruments of the king's pleasure, and threatened the king with the ban if he did not separate from Berthrade. He demanded, under the same threat, the liberation of Yves. This demand was complied with; but the might of papal authority still could not do the work thoroughly. A council, which assembled at Rheims in 1094, once more allowed itself to be determined by its dependence on the king and cited bishop Yves, who was animated by a different spirit, before its tribunal, to answer to the charge of high treason and of violating his oath of allegiance to the king. Yves protested against the competency of this tribunal, and appealed to the pope; and in a letter relating to this matter,§ he said, "The charge of high-treason fell with more justice upon those who by their treach-

\* Ep. 47.

† He writes to the Marshal of the royal court (Dapifer): *Ex auctoritate divina hoc caritati tuæ rescribo, quia nulla redemptione vel commutatione quis peccatum suum poterit abolere, quamdiu vult in eo permanere. Nemo in peccato suo perdurare volens peccatum suum poterit aliqua elemosyna vel oblatione redimere.*

‡ *Cum Deus non nostra, sed nos ad salutem nostram requirat.*

§ Ep. 35.

grous compliance had done the king most harm, who had shrunk from applying sharper remedies for healing the wound, when milder ones were unavailing." \* "If you had, with me, held fast to this principle," he writes to them, "you would have already restored our patient to health. Consider whether, so long as you neglect to do this, you evince that perfect fidelity to the king which you are bound to show; whether you rightly discharge the duty of your calling. Let the king then," concluded this pious man, in a truly apostolical spirit. "do towards me what, under God's permission, he may please and be able to do. Let him shut me up, or shut me out, and deprive me of the protection of the law. By the inspiration and under the guidance of the grace of God, have I resolved to suffer for the law of my God; and no consideration shall induce me to participate in the guilt of those in whose punishment I would not share also." In the very same year the pope's threat was executed on the king. At a council in Autun, A. D. 1094, the archbishop Hugo of Lyons, as papal legate, actually pronounced the ban on the king, and not till the latter submitted and made professions of amendment † did the pope remove the ban, which, however, on finding that he had been deceived, he pronounced anew, at the council of Clermont.

Meantime there had been developing itself among the Western nations a great movement, which, beyond every other, could not fail so to operate as to increase the authority of the pope and exalt his dignity; for he was called to place himself at the head of a vast undertaking which grew out of and was consecrated to the religious interest, which was seized with mighty enthusiasm by the nations, and for which vast forces were leagued together. This was an event upon

\* Quod, ut pace vestra dicam, rectius in eos retorqueri potest, qui vulnus fomentis inextinguibile, tanquam pii medici cauteriis competentibus dissimulant urere vel medicinali ferro præcidere.

† Yves warned the pope (ep. 46) not to let himself be deceived by the envoys of the king, and induced to grant him absolution. It was intended to alarm the pope by the threat that the king, if he were not pronounced free from the ban, would go over to the pope of the imperial party. Yves wrote him: What hope of sinning with impunity will be given hereafter to transgressors, if forgiveness is granted to the impenitent, is a point on which I need not detain your wisdom, since it is especially your business not to protect sinners but to punish them.

which Urban could not have made any previous calculation—a long-prepared event, and hastened to its crisis by a circumstance in itself insignificant. Already had Silvester the Second and Gregory the Seventh broached the idea of an expedition of Western Christendom for the liberation of their fellow-believers in the East, and for the recovery of the holy places; but the minds of men were not as yet quite ripe for such a thought: there was need, in the first place, of a gradual preparation. Pope Victor the Third issued, in the year 1086, an invitation for a crusade, to be undertaken under the banner of St. Peter, against the Saracens in North Africa, and promised to all who should take part in it a plenary indulgence. After this came pilgrims from the East, with most distressing accounts of the insults and ill treatment which Christians had to suffer from the rude Mohammedans, and of the manifold profanations of the holy places. Among these pilgrims one deserves particularly to be mentioned, the hermit Peter of Amiens (*Ambianensis*). This individual believed himself divinely called, by visions in which Christ appeared to him, to invoke the assistance of Western Christians in recovering the holy places and the original seats of Christianity; and he brought with him a letter of complaint, calling for help, written by the patriarch of Jerusalem. He first sought an interview with pope Urban; and that pope was himself deeply affected, as well by the personal narrative of the monk as by the letter of which he was the bearer. He commissioned monk Peter to travel through the countries, and, testifying before high and low to the scenes he had witnessed, call upon them to go to the rescue of the East, now groaning under so heavy a yoke, and of the Holy Sepulchre. Peter the Hermit was a person of small stature and ungainly shape; but the fire of his eloquence, the strong faith, and the enthusiasm which furnished him with a copious flow of language, made a greater impression in proportion to the weakness of the instrument. It is to be remarked, as a peculiar trait in the life of these times, that men of mean outward appearance, and with bodily frames worn down by deprivation, were enabled by a fiery energy of discourse to produce the greatest effects. In a monkish cowl, and a woollen gown or cloak over it, this Peter itinerated the countries, barefoot, and riding on a mule. Immense crowds of people gathered round

him: he was loaded with presents, and from these he bountifully distributed to the poor; his words were received as the utterances of an oracle, and he made many a good use of the high influence he enjoyed; by his exhortations he wrought a change of character in abandoned women, for whom he procured husbands, and then bestowed on them a dowry; he reconciled contending parties to one another; he was venerated as a saint; men were eager to obtain from him something in the shape of a relic, were it but a hair from his mule. A contemporary and eye-witness who relates this, the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy (Guibertus Novigentensis),\* says that he does not remember having ever witnessed the like veneration paid to any man; but he looks upon it as the effect which the charm of novelty exercises on the minds of the multitude.† Thus, by the labours of this individual, were the minds of men already prepared, when Urban, in the year 1095, held the church assembly at Placenza, at which he first brought this matter forward. The assembly was so numerous that no church could contain it, and they were obliged to hold their sessions in the open air.‡ At Clermont, in Auvergne, an assembly of men, of both the spiritual and secular order, was afterwards holden, which was composed of still greater numbers, because it was known beforehand that this matter, which took such hold on the universal interest and sympathy, was to be the subject of discussion. The pope, in a fiery discourse, described the importance of the city of Jerusalem in its bearing on the Christian faith, the insults and abuse which the residents of the place and the Christians sojourning there as pilgrims were obliged to suffer. Next, he invited the assembly to be zealous for the law and glory of

\* In his *Historia Hierosolymitana apud Bongars, Gesta Dei per Francos*, f. 482.

† Quod nos non ad veritatem, sed vulgo referimus amanti novitatem.

‡ Bernold of Constance, who relates this in his *Chronicle*, endeavours to show by examples that this was nothing unbecoming: Hoc tamen non absque probabilis exempli auctoritate, nam primus legislator Moses populum Dei in campestribus legalibus præceptis Deo jubente instituit, et ipse Dominus non in domibus, sed in monte et in campestribus discipulos suos evangelicis institutis informavit. Missas quoque nonnunquam extra ecclesiam satis probabiliter, necessitate quidem cogente, celebramus quamvis ecclesias earum celebrationi specialiter deputatas non ignoramus.

God ; and, impelled by the love of Christ, to grasp the sword, and turn the weapons which they had hitherto borne against Christians, and which they had stained with Christian blood, against the enemies of the Christian faith. The time was now come when, by participating in this holy work, they might atone for so many sins, robbery, and murder, and obtain forgiveness of all.\* He announced the fullest indulgence to all who, in the temper of true repentance and devotion, would take part in this expedition. He promised forgiveness of sin and eternal salvation to all who should die in Palestine in true penitence, and he took all participators in this expedition under his own papal protection. This discourse of the pope produced a great effect on the already excited minds of men ; and, after the example of Ademar, bishop of Puy, to whom the pope gave the guidance of the whole, many on the spot marked their right shoulder with the sign of the cross, as the symbol of the holy expedition, indicating their readiness to take upon them the cross of Christ, and follow him.

From this council, and from the impression which the itinerant monk Peter made on the multitude, proceeded an uninterruptedly progressive enthusiasm of the nations. It was like a voice of God to a generation given up to unrestrained passion and wild desires, amidst the mutual feuds and violent deeds of princes and knights, amidst the corruption which was only increased by that quarrel between pope and emperor—a mighty religious shock,—a new direction given to the imagination and to the feelings of men. So this fire poured out upon the nations, with which was mingled some portion at least of a holier flame, became one which, as it tended to counteract the hitherto prevailing rudeness of the fleshly sense, was considered, even by the pious and intelligent men of this age, a refining fire.† It needed no exhortations from the clergy ;

\* It is a well-known fact that we have several recensions of this discourse, and no verbally accurate record of it, so that we can only give with certainty the general thoughts.

† So says Guibert of Novigento, L. I. init. : *Quoniam omnium animis pia desinit intentio et habendi cunctorum pervasit corda libido, instituit nostro tempore prælia sancta Deus, ut ordo equestris et vulgus oberrans, qui vetustæ paganitatis exemplo in mutuas versabantur cædes, novum reperirent salutis promerendæ genus.*—And William of Tyre : *Necessarius erat hic ignis purgatorius, quo præterita, quæ nimia erant, diluerentur commissa et occupatio ista utilis, qua declinarentur futura.*

men mutually stimulated one another; there was a mutual emulation. People of every class, of all ages, from nations the most diverse, hastened to the appointed spot. Everything required for the journey was quickly collected together; though, owing to bad seasons, provisions had become dear, yet of a sudden there was a fall in the market because all vied with each other in contributing, as they were able, to promote the holy enterprise, as they also recognized in the abundance of the following year a special providence of God for the promotion of the crusade.\* Thus the extraordinary movement of mind produced by the preaching of the crusade, owing to which that which seemed impossible was made possible, appeared to contemporaries as a work of God not to be mistaken.† Yet the unprejudiced, even amongst them, were obliged to confess, that it was by no means the pure enthusiasm for a work undertaken in the interest of Christian faith, which hurried all to take part in it, but that a great variety of motives mixed in with this. Some had been awakened, by this call, out of a life stained with vices, to repentance, and sought by joining the crusade to obtain the forgiveness of their sins; while many, at other times, were led by a sudden awakening to repentance from a life of crime to embrace monasticism, there was now opened to them, in this enterprise, a more convenient way, and one more flattering to their inclinations. They might continue their accustomed mode of life as knights, and still obtain indulgence or the forgiveness of sin. Others meditated escaping in this way the civil punishments which threatened them, or delivering themselves from the oppressive burden of debt. Others were hurried along by the force of example and of the fashion. ‡

\* Fulcher of Chartres, on the year which followed upon the council of Clermont: Quo anno pax et ingens abundantia frumenti et vini per cuncta terrarum climata exuberavit, disponente Deo, ne panis inopia in via deficerent, qui cum crucibus suis juxta ejusdem præcepta eum sequi elegerant. In Bongars, l. c. f. 384.

† The men who looked upon this great movement of the nations as a work of God, still do not fail to mark the disturbing elements of vanity, self-deception, or intentional fraud. Thus the abbot Balderic, afterwards bishop of Dole, after having cited examples of this sort in his *Historia Hierosolymitana*, adds: "Hæc idcirco instruimus, ne vel aliquid præteritis videamur, vel nostratibus in vanitatibus suis pepercisse redarguamur." Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, T. I. f. 89.

‡ William of Tyre says, in Bongars, f. 641: Nec tamen apud omnes

If the religious awakening produced by the preaching of the crusades took such a turn with many as that, to speak in the language of those times, they preferred the pilgrimage to the heavenly Jerusalem, through the contemplative life of monasticism, to the pilgrimage to the earthly Jerusalem, the spiritual contest beneath the banner of the cross, to the bodily ; others, on the contrary, rejoiced at the opportunity thus afforded them of forsaking, to follow a holy vocation, the quiet and solitude of monasticism which had become irksome to them ; and even monks believed themselves warranted to break away from their confinement and grasp the sword ;\* till at length, from a necessity grounded in the life of the times, a blending together of monasticism and knighthood afterwards shaped itself into the spiritual order of knights. Under this prevailing tone of excited feeling men were easily disposed to fancy they saw miracles, and stories of miraculous works, wrought for the furtherance of the holy object, easily found credence, and were made the most of to promote the same, on the principle of the so-called pious fraud.† Men and women stood forth from among the people and pretended that a cross had been miraculously stamped on their bodies :‡ many branded this sign upon their persons with a hot iron, whether from zeal for the holy cause or purely out of

in causa erat Dominus, sed quidam, ne amicos desererent, quidam ne desides haberentur, quidam sola levitatis causa aut ut creditores suos, quibus multorum debitorum pondere tenebantur obligati, declinantes eluderent, aliis se adjuungebant.

\* Bernold of Constance attributes to this cause the misfortunes of a body of the first crusaders: Non erat autem mirum, quod propositum iter ad Hierosolimam explere non potuerunt, quia non tali humilitate et devotione, ut deberent, illud iter adorti sint. Nam et plures apostatas in comitatu suo habuerunt, qui abjecto religionis habitu, cum illis militare proposuerunt. L. c. p. 171.—And another contemporary, Baldric, states, in his *Historia Hierosolymitana*: Multi exemitæ et reclusi et monachi, domiciliis suis non satis sapienter relictis, ire viam perrexerunt, quidam autem orationis gratia ab abbatibus suis accepta licentia profecti sunt, plures autem fugiendo se subdlexerunt. Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, T. I. f. 89.

† In the appendix to Baldric's *Chronicle*, ed. Le Glay, p. 373: Porta et signa in cælo se videre multi asserebant.

‡ Multi de gente plebeja crucem sibi divinitus innatam jactando ostentabant, quod et idem quædam ex mulierculis præsumserunt, hoc enim falsum deprehensum est omnino. Baldric. *Histor. Hieros.* l. c.

•vanity.\* In the beginning of these movements an abbot was living in France who found himself unable, for want of means, to join the expedition. To obtain these, instead of mounting the cross in the usual manner, he made one, by some artificial process or other, on his forehead, and then proclaimed among the people that this mark came from an angel who had appeared to him in a vision. This story was easily believed by the people.† Many rich presents were bestowed on him; he was enabled to accomplish his purpose, and afterwards became archbishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine. In the latter part of his life he confessed the fraud, which was forgiven him on account of his pious motives, though doubtless there were some few who disapproved of this dishonesty.‡ It is no matter of wonder that many who, in consequence of a momentary paroxysm of contrition, engaged in this expedition, hoping to find in it the forgiveness of their sins, should suffer themselves to be so far misled by their false confidence as to let down the watch over themselves, and thus to be drawn into various excesses, for which the expedition and the climate furnished but too strong temptations.§ But there were also to be found examples of genuine Christian faith—captives who gave up their lives rather than deny their faith. A knight who had been distinguished from his youth for a life of piety, strict morality, and active benevolence, was taken prisoner by the Saracens, and his life spared on condition of abjuring the faith. He begged that he might be allowed time for reflection till the next Friday. When Friday came, he declared that far from him was the desire of gaining a few days' respite for his earthly life, he had only wished to give it up on that day when his Saviour had offered his for the salvation of all. ||

\* The Balderic just before mentioned, who relates this, says: *Vel peste jactantiæ vel bonæ suæ voluntatis ostentatione.*

† *Indocile et novarum rerum cupidum vulgus*, says Guibert, L. c. f. 507.

‡ Guibert calls it an *æmulatio Dei*, sed non secundum scientiam.

§ Bernold says, in the place before cited: *Sed et innumerabiles feminas secum habere non timuerunt, quæ naturalem habitum in virilem nefarie mutaverunt, cum quibus fornicati sunt, in quo Deum mirabiliter, sicut Israeliticus populus quondam, offenderunt.*

|| See Guibert, l. c. f. 508.



The spirit which gave birth to these popular expeditions i. e. the name of the Christian faith was no other than that which had stamped itself in the system of the papal theocracy, and hence the enthusiasm attending the former would necessarily give a stronger impulse to this spiritual tendency; and the light in which Urban appeared as the leader of a popular enterprise generally regarded as the work of God, could have no other effect than to establish his papal authority. What was it in the power of Guibert to do, who, supported by the forces of the emperor, ruled in Rome, in opposition to such a moral force of public sentiment as Urban had on his side? It was not till near the close of the year 1093 that the latter returned to Rome. The papal palace (the Lateran) and the castle of St. Angelo were still in the hands of the other party, and Urban was obliged to take shelter in the castle of Frangipani, a Roman devoted to his service. His party did not venture as yet to come forth openly in Rome, and his friends from a distance visited him clandestinely. The abbot Gottfried, of Vendome, a man ardently devoted to the Hildebrandian principles, who had just entered upon his office, found the pope in circumstances of great distress and overwhelmed with debt. The governor of the Lateran palace, who served the party of Guibert, offered, it is true, for a stipulated sum of money, to give up the palace; but Urban, with his cardinals and bishops, was unable to raise the amount. The zealous Gottfried of Vendome staked all his possessions to procure the sum required, and thus Urban was finally enabled to take possession of the palace which had so long been in the hands of the other party.\*

\* This abbot notices his services in the cause, in a letter to the successor of this pope, I. 8. *Quasi alter Nicodemus in domum prædicti Joannis (Fricapanis) nocte veni: ubi eum pane omnibus temporalibus bonis nudatum et alieno ære nimis oppressum inveni. Ibi per quadragessimam mansi cum illo, ejus onera, quantum potui, caritatis humeris supportavi. Quindecim vero diebus ante Pascha Ferruchius, quem Lateranensis Palatii custodem Guibertus fecerat, per internuncios locutus est cum Domino Papa, quærens ab eo pecuniam, et ipse redderet illi turrim et domum illam. Unde Dominus Papa cum Episcopis et Cardinalibus, qui secum erant, locutus, ab ipsis pecuniam quæsit, sed modicum quid apud ipsos, quoniam persecutione et paupertate simul premebantur, invenire potuit. Quem ego quum non solum tristem, verum etiam præ nimia angustia lacrimantem conspexissem, cœpi et ipse flere et flens accessi ad*

• Having accomplished such great things during his absence from the city, Urban, in the year 1096,\* marched in a sort of triumph to Italy and Rome, escorted by troops of crusaders, full of enthusiasm for their cause, who had him pronounce a blessing on their undertaking. Thus he obtained the victory over the party of Guibert, though in Rome it still continued to maintain its authority;† and the pope, before so poor, now possessed wealth enough to wrest from the party of Guibert their last prop in Rome, the castle of St. Angelo. He died in possession of the uncontested supremacy in the year 1099, after he had pronounced in a council the ban on his adversaries. In the following year died Clement, and it deserves to be noticed that his adherents resorted to the common expedient of miraculous stories, hoping by their means to uphold his authority, and to procure a saint for the party of Henry.‡ Henry the Fourth, gradually sobered by his misfortunes, persevered until his death in maintaining the quarrel with the pope, and the latter might naturally enough be disposed to sanction any means to bring about his destruction,—even encourage the rebellion of the sons against their father,§ pro-

cum dicens, ut securo iniret pactum; ibi aurum et argentum, nummos, mulos et equos expendi, et sic Lateranense habuimus et intravimus palatium. Ubi ego primus osculatus sum Domini Papæ pedem, in sede videlicet apostolica, ubi longe ante catholicus non sederat Papa.

\* In Longobardiam cum magno triumpho et gloria repedavit, says Bernold.

† Otto of Freisingen, in his work of Universal History, L. VIII. c. 6, says: “Auxilio eorum, quos ad Hierosolymitanum iter accenderat, Guibertum ab urbe excepto castro Crescentii ejecit.” Fulcher of Chartres, who was himself among these crusaders, who then came to Rome, relates how they were disturbed in their devotional exercises, in the church of St. Peter, by the violent acts of Guibert's partisans; and it may easily be conceived, that retaliation would be provoked on the other side, and bloody scenes ensue, in which the crusaders must have conquered, being the majority. Yet from Fulcher's expressions it is not to be inferred that Guibert's party was destroyed or driven away by the sword of the crusaders, but rather the contrary, for he says: “Satis proinde doluimus, cum tantam nequitiam ibi fieri vidimus, sed nil aliud facere potuimus, nisi quod a Domino vindictam inde fieri optavimus.”

‡ See a report of this sort, Cod. Bamb. in Eccard. Script. rer. Germ. II. c. 173. f. 194.

§ Those who were blinded by the hierarchical spirit, looked upon the rebellion of the sons against their father as a punishment brought on him for having rebelled against his spiritual father.

voke the shedding of blood, and palliate assassination.\* The popes, who were ready to oppose the fanaticism of the crusaders when it would vent itself on the defenceless Jews, with admonitions in a genuinely Christian spirit, felt no scruples, when blinded themselves by a fanatical party-interest, in employing the same instrument against the enemies of their papal authority, who appeared to them as rebels against the church and enemies of God. When the emperor Henry, forsaken on all other sides, still had faithful adherents in the dioceses of Liege and Cambray, pope Paschalis the Second turned against them the zeal of count Robert of Flanders, who, in the year 1099, returned from the first crusade, in which he had acted a prominent part. He exhorted him to persecute Henry, that head of the heretics, and all his friends, to the utmost extent of his power. He did not shrink from so abusing the name of God, as to write to him, that he could not offer to God a more acceptable sacrifice than that of carrying war against him who had rebelled against God, and sought to rob the church of its sovereignty. "By such battles," said he, in laying down to Robert and his knights the mode of obtaining forgiveness of sin, "they should obtain a place in the heavenly Jerusalem." But while even bishops of true piety, as bishop Otto of Bamberg, the apostle of the Pommeranians, through their entanglement in a false system, so disregarded all other human feelings and duties, could let themselves be so far misled as to deny their obligations of fidelity and gratitude to the emperor Henry, and to sanction wickedness, still the Christian sense of truth asserted

\* Men did not venture, it is true, to pronounce free from all blame those who were moved by their fanaticism to shed the blood of persons excommunicated. They were to submit to a church penance; still, however, their crime was not looked upon as properly murder. It is singular to observe the self-contradictory manner in which pope Urban the Second expresses himself on a case of this sort, when calling upon bishop Gottfried, of Lucca, to require of the assassins of the excommunicated, according to the custom of the Romish church, suitable satisfaction. *Non enim eos homicidas arbitramur, quos adversus excommunicatos zelo catholice matris ardentes eorum quoslibet trucidasse contigerit.* Yet, in order to preserve the purity of church discipline, a suitable penance should be prescribed for them: *qua divine simplicitatis oculos adversus se complacere valent, si forte quid duplicitatis pro humana fragilitate in eodem flagitio contraxerunt.* Mansi Concil. XX. f. 713.

\*its rights in opposition to the clamours of fanaticism and party-passion. This was seen in the vote of the church of Liege,\* whose organ was the free-minded, erudite monk Sigebert of Gemblours, who, in his Chronicle, where he refutes the letter addressed by pope Gregory the Seventh to Herman bishop of Metz, stood forth as a bold and energetic opponent of the Hildebrandian system.†

The clergy of Liege objected to the pope, that he had exchanged the spiritual for the secular sword. "If our respect for the apostolical dignity may allow us to say it," they wrote to him, "we would say, the pope was asleep, and his councilors were asleep, when they suffered the publication of such a mandate for the devastation of the communities of God. We pray him to consider whether he leads a beloved son in the right way, when he promises him an entrance into the heavenly Jerusalem by attacking and desolating the church of God. Whence this new example, that he who is called to be a messenger of peace should by his *own* mouth, and *another's* hand, declare war against the church? The laws of the church allow even clergymen to take up arms in defence of the city and church against barbarians and God's enemies; but nowhere do we read that, by any ecclesiastical authority, war has been proclaimed against the church. Jesus, the apostles, and the apostolical men proclaim peace; they punished the erring with all patience and admonition. The disobedient, Paul bids us punish severely. And how this should be done, Christ tells us, 'Let him be to thee as an heathen man and a publican;' and this is a worse evil than if he should be struck by the sword, consumed by the flames, or thrown before wild beasts. He is thus more severely punished when he is left unpunished. Who, now, would superadd to God's punishment that of man? But why should these clergymen be excommunicated? Is it, perhaps, because they are devoted to their bishop, and the latter to the party of his lord the emperor?

\* See the *Epistola Leodiensium adversus Pasch.* in Harduin. Conc. T. VI. p. ii. f. 1770.

† See concerning this person, the *Commentatio* recently composed by a promising young historian, Dr. Hirsch. Sigebert designates himself as the author of that remarkable letter near the close of his tract, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, where he speaks of himself. See *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica*, ed. Fabric. f. 114.

This is the very beginning of all evil, that Satan should have succeeded to sow discord between the church and the empire." They would not presume to antedate the Lord's judgment, by which the good fruit and the tares were finally to be separated from each other. How much of the good fruit might *he* pluck away, who would cull out the tares before the harvest? A gentle hint to the pope, not to condemn prematurely. "And who can rightly censure the bishop that holds sacred the oath of allegiance he has sworn to his sovereign? How grievous a sin perjury is, those very persons know who have brought about the recent breach betwixt the empire and the church; since they promise by their new maxims dispensation from the guilt of perjury to those who have violated the oath of fidelity to their sovereign!" They object to the pope, the unapostolic harshness with which he treated them.\* They maintained, indeed, that princes might be respectfully admonished and corrected, but that they could not be deposed by the popes.† They doubted, in fact, the right of the popes to pronounce the ban on princes. The jurisdiction over them, the King of kings, who appointed them his vicegerents on earth, had reserved in his own hands; a position inconsistent, to be sure, with the position maintained by the spirit of this age, and one by which the theocratical jurisdiction of the church, restricted by arbitrary limitations, would have wholly lost its importance; so that, in the end, it could only have reached the weak, while

\* They speak thus strongly: *Eructavit cor David regis verbum bonum, evomuit cor Domini Paschasii vile convicium, prout vetulæ et texitrices faciunt. Petrus apostolus docet: non dominantes in clero, sed forma facti gregis. Paulus apostolus ad Galatas delinquentes ait: Filioli, quos iterum parturio in Domino. Hos igitur attendat Dominus Paschasius pios admonitores, non impios conviciatores.*

† Concerning the papal ban against princes: *Maledictum excommunicationis, quod ex novella traditione Hildebrandus, Odardus (Urbanus Secundus) et iste tertius indiscrete protulerunt, omnino abjicimus et priores sanctos patres usque nunc veneramus et tenemus, qui dictante Spiritu sancto, non animi motu in majoribus et minoribus potestatibus graviter delinquentibus quædam dissimulaverunt, quædam correxerunt, quædam toleraverunt, . . . Si quis denique respectu sancti Spiritus vetus et novum testamentum gestaque resolverit, patenter inveniet, quod aut minime aut difficile possunt reges aut imperatores excommunicari et adhuc sub iudice lis est. Admoneri quidem possunt, increpari, argui a timoratis, et discretis viris, quia quos Christus in terris rex regum vice sua constituit, damnandos et salvandos suo iudicio reliquit.*

the powerful, the very ones on whom it might prove most salutary, would have remained wholly untouched. They defend, against the principles established by the popes of these times, the old ecclesiastical law, and the authority of bishops, archbishops, and provincial synods; they maintain that only on graver matters (*graviora negotia*) a report was to be made out to Rome. But they declared strongly against the papal legates *à latere*, who did nothing but travel up and down to enrich themselves; from which no amendment of life proceeded, but assassination and spoliation of the church.\* They maintained, therefore, that they did not deserve the reproaches of the pope, since they had only acted according to their duty. They took no part in politics. They never attended the assemblies of the princes, but left the decision of political questions to their superiors, to whose province it belonged. The reproach fell with more justice on popes who were actuated by mere worldly pride. That from the time of pope Sylvester to Hildebrand false popes had been judged by emperors, the imperial authority was of greater force than the papal ban.† Our Lord says: If I have spoken evil, show it me. Paul boldly withstood Peter. “Wherefore, then, should the Roman bishops not be reprov’d for manifest error? He who is not willing to be set right, is a false bishop.”‡ They would not enter at present into any defence of their sovereign. “But even were he such as the pope represents, still would we let him rule over us, since we should regard it as a judgment of God hung over us on account of our sins. Still, we should not be authorized to lift up the sword against him; but prayer would be our only

\* Illos vero legatos a latere Romani episcopi exeuntes et additanda marsupia discurrentes, omnino refutamus, sicut temporibus Zosimi, Cœlestini, Bonifacii concilia Africana probaverunt. Etenim ut a fructibus eorum cognoscamus eos, non morum correctio, non vitæ emendatio, sed inde hominum, cades et ecclesiarum Dei proveniunt deprædationes.

† Potius depositu spiritu præsumptionis cum suis consiliariis sollerter recolligat, quomodo a beato Silvestro usque ad Hildebrandum sedem Romanam obtinuerint, et quot et quanta inaudita ex illius sedis ambitione perpetrata sint, et quomodo per reges et imperatores definita sint, et pseudopapæ damnati et abdicati sint et ibi plus valuit virtus imperialis, quam excommunicatio Hildebrandi, Odardi, Paschasii.

‡ Ergo remoto Romanæ ambitionis typho, cur de gravibus et manifestis non reprehendantur et corrigantur Römاني episcopi? Qui reprehendi et corrigi non vult, pseudo est sive episcopus sive clericus.

refuge. Why do the popes hand down to each other as an inheritance, the war against king Henry, whom they persecute with unjust excommunications, when they are bound to obey him as their rightful sovereign? To be sure, he who is excommunicated by the judgment of the Holy Ghost is to be repelled from the house of God; but who would say that when one has been excommunicated with injustice, in respect to his cause or in respect to his person, that such an one has been excommunicated by the judgment of the Holy Ghost? Gregory the Seventh expressed the principle, and applied it in practice, that the bishop of Rome can absolve one unjustly excommunicated by another. And if the bishop of Rome can do this, why should not God be able to absolve one unjustly excommunicated by the pope? For to no one can any real injury be done by another, if he has not first injured himself." Finally, they speak with the greatest abhorrence of the fact, that the pope had promised the count forgiveness of sins on such conditions. "What new authority is this, by which impunity for sins committed, and freedom for such as are to be committed hereafter, is promised to the guilty without confession and penance? How wide hast thou thus thrown open the doors for all iniquity? \* Thee, O mother, may God deliver from all iniquity. May Jesus be thy door, and open to thee that door. No one enters unless he opens. Thee, and those who are set over thee, may God deliver from such as betray the people." (Micah i.)

Urban's successor, Paschalis the Second, also followed, it is true, the Hildebrandian system, like his predecessors: but he wanted Gregory's spirit, firmness, and energy.† He reaped the reward of his own iniquity in countenancing the inconsiderate rebellion of Henry the Fifth against his father; for that prince showed himself obedient to the pope only so long as he stood in need of him for the attainment of his ends. But no sooner was he in possession of the power, than he revived the

\* Unde ergo hæc nova auctoritas, per quam reis sine confessione et pœnitentia affertur præteritorum peccatorum impunitas et futurorum libertas? Quantam fenestram malitiæ per hoc patefecisti hominibus?

† Guibert of Novigentum represents him as being a weak and imperfectly educated man, in the third book of his autobiography. He says of him: "Erat minus, quam suo competeret officio, literatus." De vita sua, L. III. c. 4.

old quarrel respecting the investiture, and, after threatening at a distance, in the year 1110 entered Italy with an army. At Sutri, a treaty was concluded between the pope and the emperor, by which treaty the contest which had continued so long was finally to be settled. The imperial party had, in fact, in this contest, always insisted on the principle, that to Cæsar must be rendered the things of Cæsar, as well as to God the things that are God's; that if the bishops would retain the possessions and privileges they had received from the empire, they should fulfil the obligations due to the empire for them. If they refused coming to any such understanding, they should restore back what they had received from the empire, and be content with that which the church originally possessed. It might with justice be said, that the church, by usurping a province not her own, but belonging to the secular power, made herself dependent on that power; that the bishops and abbots had been misled thereby to lose sight of their spiritual duties in attending to secular business. The pope, in his letter to the emperor Henry the Fifth, might not without reason complain of it as an evil, that the servants of the altar had become servants of the curia; that they had received from the princes mints, castles, and cities; whereby they were obliged to appear at court, to take part in wars and in many other affairs, incompatible with their vocation.\* Accordingly, those possessions and privileges which, under Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and the Othos, had been bestowed on churches, should now be restored back to the empire, in order that the bishops might, with less distraction, attend to the spiritual welfare of their communities.† Upon this condition, Henry the Fifth might

\* Ep. 22. In vestri regni partibus episcopi vel abbates adeo curis sæcularibus occupantur, ut comitatum assidue frequentare, et militiam exercere cogantur, quæ nimirum aut vix aut nullo modo sine rapinis, sacrilegiis, incendiis aut homicidiis exhibentur. Ministri vero altaris ministri curiæ facti sunt, quia civitates, ducatus, marchionatus, monetas, turres et cætera ad regni servitium pertinentia a regibus acceperunt. Unde etiam mos ecclesiæ inolevit, ut electi episcopi nullo modo consecrationem acciperent, nisi per manum regiam investirentur. Also Gerhoh of Reichersberg remarks, in opposition to that mixing together of spiritual and secular concerns: Ducatus, comitatus, telonia, moneta pertinent ad sæculum. See his work, *De ædificio Dei*, c. x. in *Pez thesaurus anecdot.* T. II. p. ii. f. 281.

† Oportet enim episcopos curis sæcularibus expeditos curam suorum agere populorum nec ecclesiis suis abesse diutius.



be willing to renounce the right of investiture; and Paschalis, when he had done so, could bestow on him the coronation in Rome. A treaty of this sort was concluded at Sutri. But at that time things spiritual and secular in Germany had become so jumbled together, that a sudden separation of this sort could not be carried into effect; and men were not wanting, who called it sacrilege to think of depriving the church of that which belonged to her by long years of possession.\* The emperor may perhaps already have foreseen,† that the German bishops would not be inclined to let secular matters alone; and may have drawn up his plan with reference to the expected issue. But Paschalis shows himself, in all these transactions, a weak man, governed by the influences of passing events and the force of circumstances; and in the present case he acted without any calculation either of the consequences or the practicability of the treaty. Accordingly, when the emperor and the pope came together at Rome, A. D. 1111, and the treaty was made known to the German prelates, they declined giving up the regalia. The emperor now, on his part, would not consent to renounce the investiture, which he had promised to do only under this condition, and yet he demanded of the pope, since he had performed his part of the treaty, the imperial coronation. As the pope declined, and refused to recall the old veto against the investiture, he with his cardinals were arrested and imprisoned; and, for the purpose of obtaining his liberty again, he concluded, in the year 1112, a treaty with the emperor, by virtue of which he conceded to him the right of bestowing, by staff and ring, the investiture on bishops and abbots elected freely and without

\* When Gerhoh spoke in opposition to that mixing together of spiritual and secular concerns by the German prelates, he was in fear that he should give offence to those who said: *Tales semel ecclesiis donata quacunque occasione ab illis auferentes sacrilegium committere, quoniam ecclesia rem semel acceptam et diutina possessione mancipatam non potest amittere.* In the work already cited, *De ædificio Dei*. L. c.

† Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in his book *De statu ecclesiæ*, c. xxi. Gretser, *opp.* T. VI. f. 251, says of the emperor: *Hæc sane promittens sciebat, non consensum iri ab episcopis præcipue Germaniæ et Galliæ atque Saxoniz, sed per promissa speciem quandam pietatis habentia ad perceptionem imperialis coronæ per benedictionem Romani pontificis imponendæ nitebatur.*

simony.\* Had the pope held out firmly in the contest with the emperor, he might have reckoned upon the force of public opinion, which must have protested strongly against such violence done to the person of the head of the church. It is evident from the expressions of Hildebert of Mans, who was by no means a zealot, how enormous a crime this appeared.† He would have been venerated as a martyr; but the man who had hitherto so zealously served the cause of the papacy, for that very reason lost so much the more by *yielding*. Great must have been the impression made upon his age, when it was found that the pope, from motives of fear, proved unfaithful to the system which he had before so earnestly defended, and for which Gregory the Seventh had perseveringly fought, at the cost of everything, till his death. The name of Paschalis, as the man who had cowardly betrayed the liberties of the church, and made her dependent on the emperors, was handed down from one generation to another through the twelfth century. Thus, for example, in the prophecies of the abbot Joachim of Calabria, towards the close of this century, where he describes the growing corruption of the church, Paschalis holds a prominent place in the picture.‡ The abbot Gottfried of Vendome

\* Ut regni tui episcopis vel abbatibus libere præter violentiam vel simoniam electis investituram virgæ et annuli conferas, post investitionem vero canonice consecrationem accipiant ab episcopo, ad quem pertinerit.

† See his L. II. ep. 21. The same writer objects to Henry his double crime against his real and against his spiritual father. Quis enim potest præter eum inveniri, qui patres suos, spiritualem pariter et carnalem subdola cepit factione? Iste est, qui præceptis Dominicis in utraque tabula contradicit. Nam, ut de his, quæ actu priora sunt, prius dicam, patrem carnis suæ non honoravit, sed captivavit prius et deinceps expulit fraudulenter et in Deum postmodum et ejus ecclesiam insurrexit et de Sede Petri vicarium usque in vincula perturbavit.

‡ Although he calls him Paschasius the *Third*, and says many things which do not agree with an exact knowledge of history, yet we can conceive of no other Paschalis that can be meant. In the Commentary on the prophet Jeremiah, we read: Libertas ecclesiæ ancillanda est et statuenda sub tributo a papa Paschasio tertio. Non est plangendus, quia etsi captivus a duce Normannico (which title here is not correct), ponere debuit animam pro justitia ecclesiæ et non infringere libertatem ejus et tradere servituti, de qua collum non excutiet sic de levi. See the edition of Cologne, 1577, p. 312; and in another place: The servitude of the popes began in pope Paschalis, quem dux Normannicus cœpit et contra

loaded him with the severest reproaches,\* and expressed a determination to renounce obedience to him if he remained faithful to that treaty. He held up before him the example of the old martyrs, as well as that of the two apostles who laid the foundations of the Roman church. If the successor of such men, sitting on their seat, by acting contrary to their example, has robbed himself of their glorious lot, then, said he in his letter to the pope, he ought himself to annul what he has done, and, as a second Peter, expiate the fault by tears of repentance. If, through weakness of the flesh, he had from the fear of death wavered for a moment, the spirit should keep itself pure by reforming the works of the flesh; nor should he himself wish to excuse by pleading the latter, which at any rate must die, an act which he might have avoided, and so gained a glorious immortality. Nor could he excuse himself by pleading anxiety for the lives of his sons the cardinals; for he ought to have been much more concerned for the everlasting than for the temporal welfare of his sons; and instead of eking out a brief life to them, by exposing the church to ruin and their souls to injury, he should by his own example have fired them on to meet a glorious martyrdom; for the object, as it seemed to him, was worthy of such a sacrifice. The lay-investiture, whereby the power was conceded to laymen of conveying a spiritual possession, appeared to him as a denial of the faith and of the freedom of the church,—as a veritable heresy. He begged the pope not to add to his fault by trying to excuse it, but rather to amend it. He did not hesitate to tell him that, although even a vicious pope must be tolerated, yet the case stood quite otherwise with an heretical one. Against such a pope, any man, who did but remain true to the faith himself, might stand forth as an accuser.†

There were, among the adherents of the church theocratical system, two parties; one rigid and stiff, the other milder. The

*libertatem ecclesiæ privilegia fecit et indulsit invitus, quæ postea liberatus fregit.* P. 259 \* Ep. 7.

† When, in another legal affair, he invited his assistance, he wrote to him (ep. 6): *Non vos ultra modum afficiat, si qua fuit sinistra operatio, non perturbet oculum mentis vestræ regis exactio, sed quanto fortius potestis, jura justitiæ in rebus aliis teneatis nunc ex deliberatione, ut quod regi fecit vestra humanitas, fecisse credatur pro vita filiorum paterna compassione.*

former, of which we may consider the abbot Gottfried of Vendome, in his then position, a representative, declared, without reserve, that maintaining the right of lay-investiture was a heresy, because thereby the right was attributed to laymen of conveying a spiritual possession; and according to the judgment of this party, the pope, if he did not revoke that which he had done through weakness, made himself liable to condemnation, and men were authorized and bound to renounce obedience to him as a promoter of heresy. Others judged the conduct and the person of the pope more mildly, though they considered the lay-investiture as unjustifiable. To this party belonged two other distinguished men of the French church, Hildebert, bishop of Mans, and Yves, bishop of Chartres. The former was not only ready to excuse the pope's conduct, but even represented it as exemplary. "The pope," says he, "has ventured his life for the church, and yielded only for a moment to put a stop to the effusion of blood, and to desolation. Another cannot so transport himself into the critical and perilous situation of the head of the church as to be entitled to judge him. It behoves not the man living in comfortable ease to accuse the bleeding warrior of fear.\* The pope," he thought, "was obliged to accommodate himself to circumstances. The oftentimes misinterpreted and misapplied example of the apostle Paul was employed, to the great wrong of truth, in palliation of crooked courses. Where we cannot know the heart, we ought to presume the best motives; and no man should set himself up as judge over the pope, who, as universal bishop, is empowered to alter and rescind all laws."†

Yves of Chartres declared himself, it is true, in favour of the principles promulgated by Gregory the Seventh and Urban the Second against lay-investiture, but he also excused the forced compliance of Paschalis. His advice was, that confidential, affectionate letters should be addressed to the pope, exhorting him to condemn himself or to retract what had been done.‡ If he did so, men would thank God, and the whole

\* Ep. 22. *Delibutus unguentis cruentum militem formidinis non accusat.*

† *Quæcunque nescimus quo animo fiant, interpretemur in melius. Universalis episcopus omnium habet leges et jura rescindere.*

‡ Ep. 233. *Quia verendo patris debemus potius velare quam nudare,*

church rejoice over the recovery of their head;\* but if the pope proved incurable, still it did not belong to others to pass judgment on him. The archbishop John of Lyons, having called together a council, at which the subject of lay-investiture, as an affair concerning the faith, and the treaty between the pope and the emperor, were to be brought into discussion, Yves wrote to this archbishop a letter,† warning him against taking any irrevocable steps in this matter, and recommending moderation. He sought to excuse the pope, who had yielded only to force, and for the purpose of avoiding a greater evil, by holding up the examples of Moses and of Paul, showing how the latter had allowed Timothy to be circumcised, in order by this accommodation to gain the Jews. “God has permitted the greatest and holiest men, when they have given way to a necessity which seemed to exculpate them, or have descended to a prudent accommodation, to fall into such weaknesses, in order that they might thereby be led to a knowledge of their own hearts, learn to ascribe their weaknesses to themselves, and to feel their indebtedness to the grace of God for all the good that is in them.” He refused to assist in any council met to deliberate on this affair, since it was out of the power of any to judge the party against whom they would have to proceed; for the pope was amenable to the judgment of no man. Although he declared himself opposed to lay-investiture, still he would not concede to those who drove the matter to an extreme, and drew rash conclusions, that the maintaining of lay-investiture was a heresy, a sin against the Holy Ghost. “For heresy,” he thought, “had reference to the faith, and faith had its seat within; but investiture was an external thing.‡ Whatever is founded on eternal law could, indeed, never be altered; but in that which proceeded from no such law, but was ordered and arranged with reference to certain necessities of the times, for the honour and advantage of

*familiaribus et caritatem redolentibus literis admonendus mihi videtur, ut se judicet aut factum suum retractet.*

\* *Omnis ecclesia, quæ graviter languet, dum caput ejus laborat tanta debilitatum molestia.*

† There were several eminent French bishops, in whose name this was written. Ep. 236.

‡ *Fides et error ex corde procedunt, investitura vero illa, de qua tantus est motus, in solis est manibus dantis et accipientis, quæ bona et mala agere possunt, credere vel errare in fide non possunt.*

the church, something doubtless might be remitted for the moment, out of regard to changing circumstances.\* But if a layman claimed the power of bestowing, with the investiture, a sacrament, or a *rem sacramenti*, such a person would be a heretic, not on account of the investiture in itself, but on account of the usurpation connected with it. The lay-investiture, as the wresting to one's self of a right belonging to another, ought assuredly, for the sake of the honour and freedom of the church, to be wholly abolished, if it could be done without disturbing the peace; but where this could not be done without danger of a schism, it must be suffered to remain for a while under a discreet protest." The archbishop John of Lyons, however, in his reply, expressed his regret to find that the pope would not allow the weak spots which he had exposed to be covered.† To the remarks of Yves with regard to the mitigation of the judgment concerning lay-investiture, he replied—"It is true, faith and heresies have their seat in the heart: but as the believing man is known by his works, so also is the heretic by his. Although the outward act, as such, is not heretical, still it may be of such a kind that something heretical lies at the bottom of it. If, therefore, the outward act of investiture by laymen is in itself nothing heretical, still the maintaining and defending it proceeds from heretical principles."

Deserving of notice is the book which, amid these movements, the prior Placidus of Nonantula wrote in defence of the honour of the church,‡ as it is especially calculated to convey a knowledge of the relation in which the different parties stood to each other. This book is directed partly against those who defended the lay-investiture with a view to the interests of *the state*; partly against those who, from *the position of papal absolutism*, maintained that no one could set himself up as judge over the decision of the pope. The former were led by

\* Cum ergo ea, quæ æterna lege sancita non sunt, sed pro honestate et utilitate ecclesiæ instituta vel prohibita, pro eadem occasione ad tempus remittuntur pro qua inventa sunt, non est institutorum damnosa prævaricatio, sed laudabilis et saluberrima dispensatio.

† Utinam ipse pater pudenda (ut dicis) ista pro voluntate nostra contegi pateretur.

‡ Liber de honore ecclesiæ. Pez thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, T. II. p. ii. f. 75.

the reaction against the theocracy, which subordinated everything secular to itself, to give prominence to the purely spiritual idea of the church. "The church," said they, "is a thing purely spiritual; hence, of earthly matters, nothing belongs to it but the place in which the faithful are assembled, and which is denominated a church.\* The servants of the church can, according to her laws, lay claim to no earthly possession; nothing is due to them but the tithes, firstlings, and oblations of the altar; whatsoever more they desire to have, they can only receive from the monarch. The church and its precincts consecrated to God belong, it is allowed, to none but God and his priests; but what the church now glorified throughout the whole world possesses—cities, castles, public mints, &c.†—all this belongs to the emperor, and this the shepherds of the church cannot possess, unless it be constantly bestowed on them, over and over again, by the emperor. How should not the churches be subject, on account of their earthly possessions, to him to whom the whole land is subject? ‡ If, in order to the choice of a shepherd, the agreement of *the whole community* is required, how much more must this be the case in regard to emperors or princes?" This party, in order to defend lay-investiture, appealed to the fact, that even the emperor was the Lord's anointed, by virtue of the anointing with holy oil which was bestowed on him. To these arguments Placidus replied:—"To be sure the church is a spiritual society, the community of believers,

\* *Ecclesia spiritualis est et ideo nihil ei terrenarum rerum pertinet, nisi locus tantum, qui consueto nomine ecclesia dicitur.*

† *Ducatus, marchiæ, comitatus, advocatiæ, monetæ publicæ, civitates et castra.*

‡ A comparison of our citations from this book with what Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in his work, *De statu ecclesiæ, sub Henrico Quarto et Quinto imperatoribus et Gregorio Septo, nonnullisque consequentibus Romanis Pontificibus*, published by the Jesuit Gretser, (T. VI. opp.) puts in the mouth of the defenders of the cause of Henry (qui pro parte erant regis ajebant), serves also to show that from these communications of Placidus we may learn what were the principles maintained by a whole party; and we see of how much importance this dispute about principles was. According to the quotation of Gerhoh, the imperial party said: "If the bishops wished to remain heads of the empire, then they must consent to be invested, like all others, by the emperor, with the concurrence of the other members of the imperial diet." *Non imperio concedet, ut aliquis in principem, nisi ab ipso imperatore ex consilio aliorum principum assumatur.* L. c. f. 259.

which has been adorned with the gifts of the Holy Spirit ; but she should also be honoured by her consecrated earthly gifts, and what has once been given to her cannot again be wrested from her without sacrilege. Just so the worship of God ; though it has its seat in the heart, yet must appear outwardly and present itself in a visible manner, and visible temples must be erected to his honour. According to the promises of the prophets, the once persecuted church should at length be outwardly glorified. As the soul cannot, in this present life, subsist without the body, so neither can the spiritual subsist without the corporeal, and the latter is sanctified through its connection with the former." Many, whom Placidus calls "simplices," said, "If things go on in this way, the church will in the end absorb all earthly interests into itself." He replies, by quoting the words of Christ, "All men cannot receive this saying (*i. e.* few are so far advanced in the spiritual direction as to perceive how everything earthly should, in fact, be consecrated to the church); for when would all give their possessions to the church, if now they seek to deprive her even of that which has been her property for ages? The plenty which is now in the hands of the church, belongs to her no less than the little did which she once possessed. Both belong to her for the same reason, because it is property consecrated to God. The same Being who once formed her by want, has now enriched and glorified her. What would be said of the man who should maintain that the emperor has no right indeed to a house that belongs to one of his subjects ; yet the possessions of the house belong to the emperor in the sense that no one has a right to dispose of them unless he receive it from the emperor? Princes should by no means be excluded from participating in the election of bishops ; but they should do so as members of the community—as sons, not as lords of the church. They should not by their *own authority* give shepherds to the church, whether by investiture or by any other exercise of their sovereignty ; but bishops should be appointed by the common choice of the clergy and the concurrence of the communities, of the high and the low, among whom princes also belong. The emperor is anointed, not that he may rule the *church*, but that he may faithfully govern the empire."

He next proceeds to combat those who argued that the pope



could not take back his oath to the emperor, by which he conceded to him the right of investiture; those who held that no man could exalt himself over the pope, the supreme lawgiver of the church; that the laws enacted by him, although new, still carried with them the obligation of obedience. He says, on the other hand, pope Paschalis, with the cardinals, had been induced by compassion to grant the emperor Henry the Fifth a privilege incompatible with the grace of the Holy Spirit and with the ecclesiastical laws. The pope was not bound to abide by this compact; but was bound to correct the mistake with all zeal, following the example of the apostle Peter, who, after having denied the Lord through fear, sought to make up the injury by greater love. An oath, whereby one promises to do a wicked thing, cannot be binding; on the contrary, the promiser should repent for having taken the name of the Lord in vain, by promising to do what he ought not to do either with or without an oath. It must be admitted that the pope may enact new laws, but only respecting matters on which the holy fathers have determined nothing, and especially on which nothing has been settled in the sacred Scriptures; but wherever our Lord or his apostles, and the holy fathers succeeding them, had manifestly determined anything, there the pope can give no new law, but is bound rather to defend that which has been once settled, until he dies. Accordingly, this Placidus calls upon every man to follow the example of all who have fought for the kingdom of God, from the apostles to Gregory the Seventh and Urban the Second,\* and to give up everything, even life itself, for the cause of righteousness.

It appears evident, from these signs of the times, that if Paschalis had been disposed to abide faithfully by the treaty which had been concluded, still he could not have carried it out in opposition to the superior power of the Hildebrandian party in the church. A new schism in the church would, in

\* Concerning Gregory the Seventh, he says: *Pro honore sanctæ ecclesiæ dimicans, multas et varias tempestates sustinuit, sed flecti non potuit, quia fundatus erat supra firmam petram.* Concerning Urban the Second, who at first could find no spot in the city of Rome where he could remain: *Qui tamen non cessit, sed patienter ferens Christo pro se obtinente, omnis hæreticorum vis destructa et ipse sanctæ ecclesiæ redditus apud beatum Petrum in sua sede beato fine quievit.*

all probability, have been the consequence of such an attempt.\* If the most zealous defenders of the church theocratical system had hitherto been zealous also for papal absolutism, they might now take another turn, and be led by zeal for their principles to stand up against the *person* of the pope; so that from a party, of which under other circumstances such a thing was least to be expected, might proceed a freer reaction against the arbitrary will of the individual who stood at the head of the church government.

But not only was Paschalis too weak to undertake to maintain, against the force of such a spirit, the step he had taken, he was also, at heart, too much affected by the same spirit himself to form any such resolution. Without doubt he had only been induced to give way by a momentary impulse of fear and weakness, and he soon began to reproach himself for what he had done, as in fact he expressed his regret at the transaction in his letters to foreign bishops.† He was desirous of retiring to private life, and of leaving it to the church to judge respecting what had been done. He deserted the papal palace, and retired to an island in the Tiber, and could only be persuaded to return by the entreaties of the cardinals and of the Roman people.‡ It might be easier for the

\* Gerhoh of Reichersberg relates, that nearly *all* the French bishops (which doubtless is exaggerated) had formed the resolution together to excommunicate the pope himself, if he would not revoke what he had conceded to the emperor Henry the Fifth. *Universi pæne Franciæ episcopi consilium inierant, quatenus excommunicarent Paschalem, tanquam ecclesiæ hostem et destructorem, nisi privilegium idem ipse, qui dedit, damnavisset.* See the above-cited tract, *De statu ecclesiæ*, chap. xxii. in Gretser, *opp.* Tome VI. f. 257.

† Yves of Chartres says (ep. 233 and 236) of the pope: *Postquam evasis periculum, sicut ipse quibusdam nostrum scripsit, quod jusserat, jussit, quod prohibuerat, prohibuit, quamvis quibusdam nefandis quædam nefanda scripta permisit.*

‡ So Hildebert, at least, relates, in the above-cited letter, following a rumour: *Renuncians domo, patriæ, rebus, officio, mortificandus in carne, Pontianam insulam commigravit. Populi vocibus, et cardinalium lacrimis revocatus in cathedram.* This is confirmed by the account of a trustworthy historian among his contemporaries, the abbot Suger of St. Denis, in his account of the life of the French king Louis the Sixth. *Vita Ludovici Grossi*, where he says of the pope: *Ad eremum solitudinis confugit moramque ibidem perpetuam fecisset, si universalis ecclesiæ et Romanorum violentia coactum non reduxisset.* See Duchesne, *Scriptores rer. Franc.* T. IV. f. 291.

pope to reconcile to his conscience the non-observance of his oath than the surrendering of any right belonging to the church. In the year 1112 he declared, before a council assembled in the Lateran, that he had been forced to make that treaty in order to save the cardinals and the city of Rome; abiding by his oath, he would himself personally undertake nothing against the emperor Henry, but it was beyond his power to surrender any of the liberties and rights of the church. He left it to the assembly to examine the treaty, and that body unanimously declared that it was contrary to the laws of the church and to divine right, and therefore null. The pope wished, by an ambiguous mode of procedure, to save his conscience and his honour at the same time; and while he forbore personally and directly to pronounce the ban on Henry the Fifth, still permitted this to be done by his legates. Thus the contest respecting investiture broke out anew, and with it was again connected, we must admit, the corrupt exercise of an arbitrary will in the filling up of spiritual offices by the court.\* The emperor had it in his power to expel the popes from Rome, and to set up against Paschalis's successor Gelasius the Second, another, chosen by his own party, the archbishop Burdinus of Braga, Gregory the Eighth.

The mischievous consequences of this schism in the churches, in which both parties combated each other with ferocious animosity, could not fail to call forth the more strongly, in all who had at heart the welfare of Christendom, the wish for a restoration of the peace of the church; these, accordingly, set themselves to devising means for bringing about a reconciliation of conflicting interests and principles. Between the stiff Hildebrandian party and those who defended lay-investiture there gradually rose up a third intermediate party. These controversies led to some important consequences. Various more profound investigations were thereby occasioned, into the relation of the church to the state, of ecclesiastical matters to

\* In the life of the archbishop Conrad the First, of Salzburg, it is related how pious ladies, at the emperor's court, had the greatest influence in the distribution of ecclesiastical preferments. See *Pez thesaur. anecdot. nov.* T. II. p. 3, f. 204; and Gerhoh says, in the above-cited tract, *De statu ecclesiæ*, c. 22: *Spretis electionibus is apud eum dignior cæteris episcopatus honore habitus est, qui ei vel familiarior extitisset vel pius obsæqui aut pecuniæ obtulisset.*

political, of spiritual matters to secular. Men of sobriety and moderation stood forth, who endeavoured to soften the extravagant excesses of the Hildebrandian zealots, in their fanatical deprecation of the civil power, and who, instead of continually harping against lay-investiture, sought to bring about an understanding on the question, as to what was essential and what unessential in the points of dispute; as to what should be held fast in order to secure the freedom of the church, and what might be conceded to the state in order to the conservation of its rights. We have already noticed, on a former page, the milder views on this subject expressed by Hildebert of Mans, and Yves of Chartres.

By occasion of the disputes between the Norman princes of England and the archbishops of Canterbury, the monk Hugo, belonging to the monastery of Fleury, wrote his work for the reconciliation of church and state, of the royalty and the priesthood.\* He combated the Gregorian position, that monarchy was not, like the priesthood, founded on a divine order, but that the former sprang from man's will, and human pride; and in opposition to those who maintained this, he held up the apostle Paul's declaration concerning the divine institution of magistrates.† He affirmed, that the relations among men were, from the first, founded upon such a subordination. He attacked the exaggerations on both sides, and, in opposition to them, held fast to the principle that to God must be rendered that which is God's, and to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's. The king should lay no restraint on the election of a bishop by the clergy and the community, to be held according to the ecclesiastical laws; and should give his concurrence to the choice when made. To the person elected, the king ought not to give the investiture with staff and ring, which, as symbols of spiritual things, belong to the archbishop; but should bestow the feoffment with secular appurtenances, and accord-

\* *De regia potestate et sacerdotali dignitate*; in Baluz. Miscellan. T. IV.

† *Scio quosdam nostris temporibus, qui reges autumant, non a Deo, sed ab his habuisse principium, qui Deum ignorantes superbia, rapinis, homicidiis et postremo pæne universis sceleribus in mundi principio diabolo agitante supra pares homines dominari cæca cupiditate affectaverunt. Quorum sententia quam sit frivola liquet apostolico documento: Non est potestas nisi a Deo, etc.*

ingly select for this some other symbol.\* The cardinal abbot Gottfried of Vendome, as we have seen above, had declared himself so strongly against the concessions of pope Paschalis in the dispute concerning the investiture as to pronounce the maintaining of the investiture by laymen a heresy; but he extricated himself from these wearisome and ruinous controversies, and, by certain notional distinctions, found a way of reconciling the antagonism between the church and the secular power.† He distinguished between that investiture which makes the bishop a bishop and that which has reference to his temporal support; ‡ between that which pertains to human and that which pertains to divine right. The church held her possessions by human right, the right which defines generally the *mine and thine*. Divine right we have in the Holy Scriptures (the ecclesiastical laws being reckoned thereto): human right in the laws of princes. Property, which belongs to human right, God has given to the church through the emperors and kings of the world. He protested against that stern hierarchical bent which would not allow princes to possess what was their own. “If thou sayest,” he remarks to the bishop, “what have I to do with the king; then call not the possessions thine; for thou hast renounced the only right by which thou *canst* call them thine.” § While now, in accordance with this distinction, he still declared the investiture by staff and ring, practised by laymen and referring to spiritual matters, a heresy, he still found nothing offensive in the fact that kings, after the completion of a free canonical election, and after the episcopal consecration, should, by the royal investiture, convey over the secular possessions and their

\* Lib. I. c. 5. Post electionem autem non anulum aut baculum a manu regia, sed investituram rerum secularium electus antistes debet suscipere et in suis ordinibus per anulum aut baculum animarum curam ab archiepiscopo suo.

† Opusc. III. to pope Calixtus, and his Tractatus de ordinatione episcoporum et de investitura Laicorum, addressed to cardinal Peter Leonis.

‡ Alia est investitura, quæ episcopum perficit, alia vero, quæ episcopum pascit.

§ Si vero dixeris: Quid mihi et regi, noli jam dicere possessiones tuas, quia ad ipsa jura, quibus possessiones possidentur, renuntiasti. Unde quisque possidet, quod possidet? Nonne jure humano? Nam jure divino Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus. Pauperes et divites Deus de uno luto fecit, et divites et pauperes una terra supportat.

own protection along with them,\* and by what sign this might be done, was, he declared, a matter of indifference to the Catholic faith.† Christ intended that the spiritual and the secular sword should serve for the defence of the church; but if one of the two beats back the other, this happens contrary to his will. Thus arise bitter feelings and schisms; thus arises corruption of the body and of the soul. And when empire and priesthood contend one against the other, both are in danger. The church ought to assert her freedom, but she ought also to guard against disorganizing excesses.‡ He calls it a work of Satan, when, under the show of right, men cause the destruction of an individual, who might have been won by indulgence.§

The way having been prepared by investigations of this sort, a treaty was brought about, after repeated negotiations, in the year 1122, between pope Calixtus the Second and the emperor Henry the Fifth, which, concluded at Worms, afterwards confirmed at the Lateran Council in 1123, was designated by the title of the Concordat of Worms. The pope conceded to the emperor the right to bestow on bishops and abbots, chosen in his presence, without violence or simony, the investiture with regalia *per sceptrum*.

When by this concordat the reconciliation between church and state, after a conflict ruinous to both, which had lasted for more than forty years, was finally effected, it was received with universal joy, even by those who in other respects were devoted to the Hildebrandian principles.|| There were, it is

\* Possunt itaque sine offensione reges post electionem canonicam et liberam consecrationem per investituram regalem in ecclesiasticis possessionibus concessionem, auxilium et defensionem episcopo dare.

† Quod quolibet signo factum extiterit, regi vel pontifici seu catholice fidei non nocebit.

‡ Habeat ecclesia suam libertatem, sed summopere caveat, ne dum nimis emunxerit, eliciat sanguinem et dum rubiginem de vase conatur eradere, vas ipsum frangatur.

§ Tunc enim a satana quis circumvenitur, quando sub specie justitiæ illum per nimiam tristitiam perire contingit, qui potuit liberari per indulgentiam.

|| Among whom belongs the so often mentioned Geroch, or Gerhoh, of Reichersberg. He was Canonics at Augsburg, and master of the cathedral school. Being a zealous adherent of the papal party, he fell into a quarrel with his bishop, Hermann of Augsburg, who defended the imperial interest. He was obliged to remove from this city, and to retire into

true, some stiff zealots who were not satisfied even with this treaty; who saw a humiliation of the priesthood in the requirement that a bishop should do homage to a layman.\* Moreover, the Hildebrandian system had for its very object to effect the complete subjection of the state under the theocratical power represented by the church: in this effort of the church, and the natural counteraction of the state, asserting its independence, was contained the germ of divisions continually breaking out afresh.

The history of the papacy in the next following times leads us to take notice of a quarrel connected with the election of a pope, which was attended with consequences more lasting and more important than usual; differing from all events of this kind heretofore related, in that the schism in this case did not proceed from the influence of opposite church-political parties, nor were opposite principles of church government maintained by the two competitors for the papal dignity. A schism of this sort might have served, by the uncertainty touching the question as to who was pope, to unsettle all faith in the papacy itself. Yet the most influential voices decided too quickly in favour of one of the two popes, to permit of any such result; and by the way in which the greatest men of the church laboured for the cause of *this* pope, the papacy could only receive an accession of glory. It was in the year 1130 that by a considerable party the Roman cardinal Gregory was chosen pope, who assumed the name of Innocent the Second; but the cardinal Peter Leonis had also a large number of adherents. The latter was grandson of a very rich Jewish banker, who had embraced Christianity; and his ancestors, during the contests of the popes with the emperors, had been enabled to perform important services for the former by means of their great wealth, with which they supported them through their difficul-

a monastery. He testifies his joy over the Concordat of Worms, whereby it was made possible for him to become reconciled with his bishop. He says: *Cessante illa commotione, in qua non erat Dominus, venit sibi-lus auræ lenis, in quo erat Dominus, faciens utraque unum, concordia reparata inter sacerdotium et imperium.* In Ps. cxxxiii. l. c. f. 2039.

\* As the archbishop Conrad of Salzburg says: it is nefas and instar sacrilegii, manus chrismatis unctione consecratas sanguineis manibus subijci et homagii exhibitione pollui. See his life in *Pez thesaurus*. L. c. f. 228.

ties. By his money he had himself also at that time acquired great influence in Rome. He called himself, as pope, Anaclete the Second. Innocent was compelled to yield to his power in Rome; nor was there any safety for him, even in Italy; for Anaclete possessed a powerful ally in Roger king of Sicily. He took refuge in France, and in that country he acquired greater power than he could have acquired in Rome; for the two heads of monasticism, who had the greatest influence on the public sentiment among the nations, the abbot Peter of Cluny and the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, espoused his interests with great zeal. More than all, he was assisted by the moral power of the abbot Bernard. This man stood then in the highest authority with the French church. In all great ecclesiastical and political affairs his voice was listened to; and it went for much with the most considerable men of church and state. In a body enfeebled by the ascetical efforts of his earlier youth, the force of his superior intellect triumphing over the frailty of its physical organ, was but the more sure to accomplish whatever he undertook. The energy of religious enthusiasm, contrasted with the pale, meagre, attenuated body, made so much the greater impression; and people of all ranks, high and low, were hurried along by it in despite of themselves.\* Whatever cause he laid hold of, he espoused with his whole soul, and spared no efforts in carrying it. Fondly as he was attached to the quiet life of contemplation, he itinerated about, notwithstanding, amidst the tumults of the nations; appeared before synods and in the assemblies of the nobles, and expended his fiery eloquence in support of the cause which he found to be righteous. This energetic man now became a hearty champion for the cause of Innocent; for him he set everything in motion, in and without France.

After Louis the Sixth, king of France, and the French church, had already been induced, through the influence of Bernard, to recognise Innocent as pope, the bishop Gerhard of

\* How Bernard appeared, and what effect he produced as an orator, is graphically described by an eye-witness, the abbot Wibald of Stavelo: *Vir ille bonus longo eremi squalore et jejuniis ac pallore confectus et in quandam spiritualis formæ tenuitatem redactus, prius persuadet visus quam auditus. Optima ei a Deo concessa est natura, eruditio summa, exercitium ingens, pronuntiatio aperta, gestus corporis ad omnem dicendi modum accommodatus.* See his ep. 147. Martene et Durand, *Collectio amplissima*, T. II. f. 339.



Angouleme, who stood up as legate for the cause of Anaclete, prolonged the contention, and by his means one of the mighty nobles, count William of Aquitaine, was gained over to the same. The latter sought by forcible measures to make the party dominant in whose favour he had declared, and persecuted all its opponents. He expelled the adherents of Innocent among the bishops from their offices. A characteristic illustration of the power which the abbot Bernard could exercise over the minds of men, as well as of the religious spirit of his times, is presented in the mode by which he finally succeeded in putting an end to the schism that had now lasted five years. Already had he brought the count to acknowledge that Innocent was pope; and that nobleman was now only resisting the demand, that the bishops should be restored to their places. After Bernard, in an interview with the count at Partheney, had tried in vain every method to bring about the object last mentioned, he repaired to the church to hold mass, and the count remained standing by the door. Then Bernard, filled with the consciousness of the greatest of all miracles which he, as an instrument of God's grace, was privileged by his priestly office to perform, elevated in the feeling of the godlike above all earthly considerations,\* holding in his hand the plate with the host—in which he saw under the figure of the bread only the veiled body of the Lord,—with flashing eye, not beseeching but commanding, stepped before the count, and said to him: “*We have entreated thee, and thou hast spurned us; the united band of God's servants have besought thee, and thou hast spurned them. Behold, here comes the Head and Lord of the Church which thou persecutest. Here is thy judge, at whose name every knee shall bow. Wilt thou spurn him, as thou hast done his servants?*” All that looked on were seized with a shuddering awe, and bowing their heads in prayer, waited in expectation of an immediate judgment from heaven. All wept. The count himself could not withstand the impression. Trembling, and as if deprived of speech, he fell to the earth. He was lifted up by his attendants, and again fell, foaming at the mouth, to the ground. Bernard himself now approached him, reached out

\* As an eye-witness, the abbot Bernald, in the account of Bernard's life, VI. 38, in his opp. ed. Mabillon the Second, f. 1107, characteristically says: *Vir Dei jam non se agens ut hominem.*

his hand for him to rise, and bid the humbled man submit to pope Innocent, and become reconciled with the deposed bishops. The count dared not contradict. He embraced the bishop of Poitiers, who was presented to him, one of those to whom he had before been most inimical; and Bernard, upon this, conversed with him familiarly, exhorting him, as a father, never again to disturb the peace of the church, and thus this schism was ended.

Twice was Bernard called to Italy. Here also he exerted a great and powerful influence on the minds of the nations: a great deal was said of his miracles. He reduced under the pope the restless Lombard cities, and helped on the triumph of Innocent, at a synod in Pisa, in 1134. In the year 1136 the latter was enabled to march triumphantly to Rome with the emperor Lothaire the Second. Bernard also came there, and sought to destroy the remains of the schism, of which king Roger in particular still continued to be the support; but he did not as yet succeed. After Anaclete's death, in the year 1138, his party chose, it is true, a successor; but yet it was not with any view of defending longer his claims to the papal throne, but only in order to secure a treaty on more advantageous terms with the other party; and in the year 1139 Innocent was at liberty to hold a Lateran council for the purpose of sealing the peace of the church.

Yet precisely at this time a furious storm broke out, by which the last years of the rule of Innocent and the reigns of the next succeeding popes were disquieted; events which were important on account of their immediate consequences, and as symptoms of a more deep-grounded reaction against the dominant church-system, for which the way was now preparing.

In order to find the origin of these commotions, we must glance back and trace the consequences of earlier events. We saw how the popes, ever since the time of Leo the Ninth, had placed themselves at the head of a movement of reform, in opposition to the corruption of the clergy; how, by this movement, individual ecclesiastics and monks of more serious minds had been incited to stand forth as castigatory preachers against the secularized clergy.\* Not only such preachers, but the

\* Of such, Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in his book: *De corrupto ecclesiæ statu*, in Baluz. Miscellan. T. V. p. 205, where he places the con-

popes themselves, as for example pope Gregory the Seventh, had also stirred up the people against the corrupt clergy.\* Thus there rose up from amongst the laity severe censors of the corrupt clergy. Doubtless many, who had ever contemplated the lives of these men with indignation and abhorrence, rejoiced at now having it in their power, under the papal authority, of giving vent to their long repressed anger; and even those, who themselves led an immoral life, made a merit of standing forth against the unchaste ecclesiastics, and driving them off from their benefices.† From this insurrection of the laity against the secularized clergy, proceeded also separatist movements, which did not restrict themselves to the limits set up by the popes. In addition to this, came now the important and lasting controversies concerning the investiture, by means of which more liberal investigations had been called forth respecting the boundaries between church and state, and their respective rights. Pope Paschalis the Second had in fact himself publicly avowed, that the regalia were to the church a foreign possession, whereby its officers were drawn aside from their appropriate spiritual duties, and betrayed into a dependence on the secular power. And there existed, as we have already remarked, an entire party who held this opinion; who demanded that the bishops and abbots, in order to be excused from taking the oath of allegiance to the princes,

flicts which these men had to sustain on a parallel with the earlier ones of the martyrs with pagan tyrants, remarks: *Novissime diebus istis viri religiosi contra simoniacos, conducticios (the itinerant clergy hired to perform mechanically the priestly functions, who were ready to strike a bargain with any body) incestuosos, dissolutos aut, quod pejus est, irregulariter congregatos clericos praelium grande tempore Gregorii Septi, habuerunt et adhuc habent.*

\* In addition to the citations made before, we may notice what the abbot Guibert, in his life written by himself, relates concerning the effects of the Hildebrandian laws of celibacy: *Erat ea tempestate nova super uxoris presbyteris apostolicæ sedis invectionio, unde et vulgi clericos zelantis tanta adversus eos rabies æstuabat, ut eos ecclesiastico privari beneficio vel abstineri sacerdotio infesto spiritu conclamarent.* Lib. I. c. 7. f. 462.

† Something of the same kind is related by Guibert (l. c.) concerning a nobleman of his district, who gave himself up to all manner of lust: *Tanta in clerum super præfato canone (the law concerning celibacy) bachebatur instantia, ac si eum singularis ad detestationem talium pulsaret pudicitia.*

should surrender back to them the regalia, restoring to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; in accordance with that precept of the apostle Paul which required the clergy not to meddle with secular business. In opposition to the practice of mixing up together things spiritual and secular, and in justification of the oath of allegiance sworn by the bishops to the emperors, propositions like the following were already advanced: If the clergy would be entirely independent of the secular power, let them, like the clergy of the primitive church, be content with the tithes and the free gifts of the communities.\*

It was a young clergyman of Brescia, by the name of Arnold, who gave the first impulse to this new reaction against the secularization of the church, and against the power of the pope in temporal things. From what we have said concerning the conflict of spiritual tendencies in this age, and particularly concerning the causes and consequences of the controversies about investiture, it is easy to explain how a young man of a serious and ardent temperament, brought up in the midst of such events and circumstances, might be carried away by this tendency, nor should we need to trace the matter to any other origin; but the account of a contemporary, which lets us into the knowledge of another circumstance that had an important influence on the development of Arnold's mind, is by no means improbable.† When the great teacher Abelard assembled around him, in a lonely region near Troyes, the youth that poured in upon him from all quarters, and by his lectures fired them with his own enthusiasm, Arnold, who in his early youth had been a reader in the church at Brescia, was one of the many

\* Gerhoh, in his book. *De statu ecclesiarum*, published by Gretser, says expressly: *Qui pro parte regis erant sufficere aiebant ecclesiasticis debere decimas et oblationes liberas id est nullo regali vel imperiali servitio obnoxias.*—*Satis, inquit, apparet, sacerdotes regibus se per hominia obligantes Deo pro sui officii gradu sufficienter placere non posse. Unde, ut ei placeant, cui se probaverunt, militiam et cætera, pro quibus hominia regibus debentur, regno libera relinquunt et ipsi vacent orationibus ovibusque Christi pascendis invigilent, ad quid instituti sunt.* Gretser, *opp. T. VI. f. 258.* Here we have the principles set forth by Arnold, as they naturally shaped themselves out of the reaction, partly of the state interest, partly of the purer Christian spirit, against the secularization of the clergy, and not as they were first excogitated by Arnold.

† Otto of Freisingen, in the 2nd book of his *History of Frederic the First*, c. 20: *Petrus Abelardum olim præceptorem habuerat.*

that did not shrink from the meagre fare and various deprivations necessary to be undergone in order to enjoy the privilege of listening to the voice of that great master.\* The speculative vein in Abelard's style and teachings did not, it is true, fall in with the peculiar bent of Arnold's mind; and perhaps even an Abelard would have found it impossible to produce any essential change in a native tendency which, as in the case of Arnold, was so much more practical than speculative. But Abelard possessed a versatility of intellect which enabled him to arouse minds of very different structure on different sides. From such of his writings as have been preserved to us, we may gather that, among other qualities, an important practical element entered also into his discourses; that he spoke sharply against the worldly temper in ecclesiastics and monks, and contrasted their condition as it actually was with what it *ought to be*. It was the religious, ethical element in Abelard's discourses which left the deepest impression on the warm and earnest heart of the young man,† and, inflamed with a holy ardour, he returned home to his native city.

\* In harmony with this is what Günther Ligerinus, in his poem on the deeds of Frederic the First, says concerning Arnold: *Tenui nutritiv Gallia sumptu edocuitque diu*. These words, it is true, might, in consequence of the relation of this historian to Otto of Freisingen, appear to be a mere repetition of the report given by the latter; but the phrase, "*tenui nutritiv sumptu*," may doubtless point to some other source; they agree very well with the time of his connection with Abelard.

† This connection between Abelard and Arnold has been doubted in these modern times. We allow, an authority so important as that of the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, seems to be against the correctness of this account; for this abbot expresses himself as if he had first made his appearance in a way altogether independent of Abelard, and had not till later, when banished from Italy he came to France, espoused the cause of that persecuted man. See Bernard, in his 189th letter to pope Innocent, s. 3: *Sibilavit apis, quæ erat in Francia, api de Italia et venerunt in unum adversus Dominum*; and ep. 195: *Exsecratus a Petro apostolo adhæserat Petro Abelardo*. We must suppose, then, that Otto of Freisingen had been led, by what he had heard concerning the later connection between Arnold and Abelard, into the mistake of representing the former as a pupil of the latter. Upon this hypothesis we must suppose that Arnold had been led, only at some later period, by the common interest of opposition to the dominant church-system, to take sides with Abelard. The testimony, however, of Otto of Freisingen, who had himself pursued his studies in France, is of importance; and we are by no means warranted to accuse him of an anachronism in his account of a fact not in itself improbable. The less inward relationship there appears at first

It was observed that he had undergone a change,—a thing not uncommon among the young secular clergy, who, awakened by some remarkable providence to a more serious religious turn of mind, altered their dress and their entire mode of life, appeared as regular canonicals, or monks, and now stood forth the bold and open chastisers of worldly ecclesiastics.\* The inspiring idea of his movements was that of a holy and pure church—a renovation of the spiritual order after the pattern of the apostolic church. His life corresponded with his doctrine. Zealously opposing the corruption of the worldly-minded clergy and monks, and requiring that clergymen and monks should follow the steps of the apostles in evangelical poverty and chastity, he set the example himself by his dress, his entire mode of living, and the ascetical severity with which he treated his own person—a fact which even his most violent adversaries could not but acknowledge.† He required that the bishops and abbots, in conformity with the teachings of Holy Scripture, should wholly renounce their worldly possessions and privileges, as well as all secular business, and give all these things back to the princes. The clergy should be content with whatever the love of the communities might bestow on them for their support—the oblations, the firstlings, and tithes. The incontinent clergy, living in luxury and debauchery, were no longer, he declared, true ecclesiastics—they were unfit to discharge the priestly functions; in

glance to have been between the teachings of Abelard and those of Arnold, the less reason have we to call in doubt an account which represents Arnold as having been a pupil of Abelard. The narrative of Günther, mentioned in the previous note, which enters into particulars, agrees with the above. How easily might it have escaped the notice of Bernard, however, who would have taken but little interest in the early life of Arnold, that, of the great crowd of young men who flocked to hear Abelard, Arnold was one!

\* The provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg would be inclined, with the views he entertained, to judge more mildly concerning the man who agreed with him in his attacks on the secularized clergy, but did not restrain himself within the same limits. He says of his teaching: *Quæ etsi zelo forte bono, sed minori scientia prolata est.* Which words Gretser cites, in a fragment from the first book of the work written by Gerhoh: *De investigatione Antichristi*, in the prolegomena to his edition of the *Scriptores contra sectam Waldensium*, in his opp. T. XII. f. 12.

† Bernard says of him, ep. 195. *Homo est neque manducans neque bibens, qui utinam tam sanæ esset doctrinæ, quam districtæ est vitæ.*

maintaining which position, he might perhaps expect to attach to his side the Hildebrandian zealots. The corrupt bishops and priests were no longer bishops and priests; the secularized church was no longer the house of God.\* It does not appear that his opposition to the corrupt church had ever led him to advance any such remarks as could be interpreted into heresy; for, had he done so, men would from the first have proceeded against him more sharply, and his opponents, who spared no pains in hunting up everything which could serve to place him in an unfavourable light, would certainly never have allowed such heretical statements of Arnold to pass unnoticed.† But we must allow that the way in which Arnold stood forth against the corruptions of the church, and especially his inclination to make the objective in the instituted order, and in the transactions of the church, depend on the subjective character of the men, might easily lead to still greater aberrations.

Arnold's discourses were directly calculated by their tendency to find ready entrance into the minds of the laity, before whose eyes the worldly lives of the ecclesiastics and monks were constantly present,‡ and to create a faction in deadly hostility to the clergy. Superadded to this was the inflammable matter already prepared by the collision of the spirit of political freedom with the power of the higher clergy.

Thus Arnold's addresses produced in the minds of the Italian people, quite susceptible to such excitements, a prodigious effect, which threatened to spread more widely, and pope Innocent felt himself called upon to take preventive measures against it. At the already-mentioned Lateran council, in the year 1139, he declared against Arnold's proceedings, and commanded him to quit Italy—the scene of the disturb-

\* Gerhoh of Reichersberg cites from him, in the work mentioned in the preceding note, an assertion like the following : *Ut domus Dei taliter ordinata domus Dei non sit vel præsules eorum non sint episcopi, quemadmodum quidam nostro tempore Arnoldus dogmatizare ausus est, plebes a talium episcoporum obedientia dehortatus.*

† Only Otto of Freisingen, after having noticed that in which all were agreed, adds : *Præter hæc de sacramento altaris, baptismo parvulorum non sane dicitur sensisse.* But this account is too vague to be safely relied on.

‡ Gunther Ligurinus says of Arnold—

*Veraque multa quidem, nisi tempora nostra fideles  
Respuerent monitus, falsis admixta monebat.*

ances thus far—altogether; and not to return again without express permission from the pope. Arnold, moreover, is said to have bound himself by an oath to obey this injunction, which probably was expressed in such terms as to leave him free to interpret it as referring exclusively to the person of pope Innocent.\* If the oath was not so expressed, he might afterwards have been accused of violating that oath. It is to be regretted that the *form* in which the sentence was pronounced against Arnold has not come down to us; but from its very character it is evident that he could not have been convicted of any false doctrine, since otherwise the pope would certainly not have treated him so mildly—would not have been contented with merely banishing him from Italy, since teachers of false doctrine would be dangerous to the church everywhere. Bernard, moreover, in his letter directed against Arnold, states that he was accused before the pope of being the author of a very bad schism. Arnold now betook himself to France, and here he became entangled in the quarrels with his old teacher Abelard, to whom he was indebted for the first impulse of his mind towards this more serious and free bent of the religious spirit. Expelled from France, he directed his steps to Switzerland, and sojourned in Zurich. The abbot Bernard thought it necessary to caution the bishop of Constance against him; but the man who had been condemned by the pope found protection there from the papal legate, cardinal Guido, who, indeed, made him a member of his household and companion of his table. The abbot Bernard severely censured that prelate, on the ground that Arnold's connection with him would contribute, without fail, to give importance and influence to that dangerous man. This deserves to be noticed on two accounts, for it makes it evident what power he could exercise over men's minds, and that no false doctrines could be charged to his account.

But independent of Arnold's personal presence, the impulse which he had given continued to operate in Italy, and the effects of it extended even to Rome. By the papal condemnation, public attention was only more strongly drawn to the subject.

\* Bernard's words, ep. 195: Accusatus apud Dominum Papam schismate pessimo, natali solo pulsus est, etiam et abjurare compulsus reversionem, nisi ad ipsius apostolici permissionem.



The Romans certainly felt no great sympathy for the religious element in that serious spirit of reform which animated Arnold; but the political movements, which had sprung out of his reforming tendency, found a point of attachment in their love of liberty, and their dreams of the ancient dominion of Rome over the world. The idea of emancipating themselves from the yoke of the pope, and of re-establishing the old republic, flattered their Roman pride. Espousing the principles of Arnold, they required that the pope, as spiritual head of the church, should confine himself to the administration of spiritual affairs; and they committed to a senate, whom they established on the capitol,\* the supreme direction of civil affairs. Innocent could do nothing to stem such a violent current; and he died. in the midst of these disturbances, in the year 1143. The mild cardinal Guido, the friend of Abelard and Arnold, became his successor, and called himself, when pope, Celestin the Second. By his gentleness, quiet was restored for a short time. Perhaps it was the news of the elevation of this friendly man to the papal throne that encouraged Arnold himself to come to Rome.† But Celestin died after six months, and Lucius the Second was his successor. Under his reign the Romans renewed the former agitations with more violence: they utterly renounced obedience to the pope, whom they recognized only in his priestly character, and the restored Roman republic sought to strike a league in opposition to the pope and to papacy with the new emperor, Conrad the Third. In the name of the "Senate and Roman people," a pompous letter was addressed to Conrad. The emperor was invited to come to Rome, that from thence, like Justinian and Constantine, in former days, he might give laws to the world. Cæsar should

\* Gerhoh of Reichersberg says: *Ædes Capitolina olim diruta et nunc reedificata contra domum Dei.* See his Commentary in Ps. lxiv. ed. Pez. L. c. f. 1182.

† Otto of Freisingen expresses himself, indeed, as if Arnold had first come to Rome in the time of Eugenius; but here he is hardly exact in his chronology. He only gathers this from the disturbances which broke out in Rome in the time of Eugenius; and the letters of the Romans to the pope, which in truth may have been written already in the time of Innocent, he places too late. The disturbances in Rome may themselves furnish evidence of an earlier visit of Arnold, though we cannot attribute everything which the Romans undertook, after the impulse had been given to them by Arnold, to his mode of thinking.

have the things that are Cæsar's; the priest the things that are the priest's, as Christ ordained when Peter paid the tribute-money.\* Long did the tendency awakened by Arnold's principles continue to agitate Rome. In the letters written amidst these commotions, by individual noblemen of Rome to the emperor, we perceive a singular mixing together of the Arnoldian spirit with the dreams of Roman vanity—a radical tendency to the separation of secular from spiritual things, which, if it had been capable enough in itself, and if it could have found more points of attachment in the age, would have brought destruction on the old theocratical system of the church. They said that the pope could claim no political sovereignty in Rome; he could not even be consecrated without the consent of the emperor—a rule which had in fact been observed till the time of Gregory the Seventh. Men complained of the worldliness of the clergy, of their bad lives, of the contradiction between their conduct and the teachings of Scripture. The popes were accused as the instigators of the wars. “The popes,” it was said, “should no longer unite the cup of the eucharist with the sword: it was their vocation to preach, and to confirm what they preached by good works.† How could those who eagerly grasped at all the wealth of this world, and corrupted the true riches of the church, the doctrine of salvation obtained by Christ, by their false doctrines and their luxurious living, receive that word of our Lord—Blessed are the poor in spirit—when they were poor themselves neither in fact nor in disposition.” Even the donative of Constantine to the Roman bishop Silvester, was declared to be a pitiable fiction. This lie had been so clearly exposed, that it was obvious to the very day-labourers and to women, and that these could put to silence the most learned men if they ventured to defend the genuineness of this donative; so that the pope, with his cardinals, no longer dared to appear in public.‡ But Arnold was perhaps the only individual in

\* *Cæsaris accipiat Cæsar, quæ sunt sua præsul,  
Ut Christus jussit Petro solvente tributum.*

† See Martene et Durand, *Collectio amplissima*. T. II. ep. 213, f. 399. *Non eis licet ferre gladium et calicem, sed prædicare, prædicationem vero bonis operibus confirmare.*

‡ *Mendacium vero illud et fabula hæretica, in qua refertur Constanti-*

whose case such a tendency was deeply rooted in religious conviction; with many it was but a transitory intoxication, in which their political interests had become merged for the moment.

The pope Lucius the Second was killed as early as 1145, in the attack on the capitol. A scholar of the great abbot Bernard, the abbot Peter Bernard of Pisa, now mounted the papal chair, under the name of Eugene the Third. As Eugene honoured and loved the abbot Bernard as his spiritual father and old preceptor, so the latter took advantage of his relation to the pope, to speak the truth to him with a plainness which no other man would easily have ventured to use. In congratulating him upon his elevation to the papal dignity, he took occasion to exhort him to do away the many abuses which had become so widely spread in the church by worldly influences. "Who will give me the satisfaction," said he in his letter,\* "of beholding the church of God, before I die, in a condition like that in which it was in ancient days, when the apostles threw out their nets, not for silver and gold, but for souls. How fervently I wish thou mightest inherit the word of that apostle whose episcopal seat thou hast acquired, of him who said, 'Thy gold perish with thee,' Acts viii. 20. O that all the enemies of Zion might tremble before this dreadful word, and shrink back abashed! This, thy mother indeed expects and requires of thee. For this, long and sigh the sons of thy mother, small and great, that every plant which our Father in heaven has not planted, may be rooted up by thy hands." He then alluded to the sudden deaths of the last predecessors of the pope, exhorting him to humility, and reminding him of his responsibility. "In all thy works," he wrote, "remember that thou art a man; and let the fear of Him who taketh away the breath of rulers, be ever before thine eyes." Eugene was soon forced to yield, it is true, to the superior force of the insurrectionary spirit in Rome, and in 1146 to take refuge in France: but, like Urban and Innocent, he too, from this country, attained to the highest triumph of the papal power.

num Silvestro imperialia simoniace concessisse, in urbe ita detecta est, ut etiam mercenarii et mulierculę quoslibet etiam doctissimos super hoc concludant et dictus apostolicus cum suis cardinalibus in civitate præ pudore apparere non audeant. Ep. 384, f. 556. L. c.

\* Ep. 238.

Like Innocent, he found there, in the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, a mightier instrument for operating on the minds of the age than he could have found in any other country; and like Urban, when banished from the ancient seat of the papacy, he was enabled to place himself at the head of a crusade proclaimed in his name, and undertaken with great enthusiasm; an enterprise from which a new impression of sacredness would be reflected back upon his own person. The news of the success which had attended the arms of the Saracens in Syria, the defeat of the Christians, the conquest of the ancient Christian territory of Edessa,\* the danger which threatened the new Christian kingdom of Jerusalem, and the holy city, had spread alarm among the Western nations, and the pope considered himself bound to summon the Christians of the West to the assistance of their hard-pressed brethren in the faith, and to the recovery of the holy places. By a letter directed to the abbot Bernard, he commissioned him to exhort the Western Christians in his name, that, for penance and forgiveness of sins, they should march to the East, to deliver their brethren, or to give up their lives for them.† Enthusiastic for the cause himself, Bernard communicated, through the power of the living word and by letters, his enthusiasm to the nations. He represented the new crusade as a means furnished by God to the multitudes sunk in sin, of calling them to repentance, and of paving the way, by devout participation in a pious work, for the forgiveness of their sins. Thus, in his letter to the clergy and people in East Frankland (Germany),‡ he exhorts them eagerly to lay hold on this opportunity: he declares that the Almighty condescended to invite murderers, robbers, adulterers, perjurers, and those sunk in other crimes, into his service, as well as the righteous. He calls upon them to make an end of waging war with one another, and to seek an object for their warlike prowess in this holy contest. "Here, brave warrior," he exclaims, "thou

\* Gerhoh of Reichersberg writes, in the year 1148: A. 1145, a Paganis capta civitate Edessa ploratus et ululatus multus auditus est et exauditus in excelsis. In Ps. xxxix. ed. Pez. L. c. f. 794.

† In Bernard's life of his disciple, the abbot Gottfried; the third Life in the edition of Mabillon, T. II. c. 4, f. 1120. It is here said that he was to present the matter before the princes and nations as the Romanæ ecclesiæ lingua.

‡ Ep. 363.

hast a field where thou mayest fight without danger, where victory is glory, and death is gain. Take the sign of the cross, and thou shalt obtain the forgiveness of all the sins which thou hast never confessed with a contrite heart." By Bernard's fiery discourses, men of all ranks were carried away.\* In France and Germany he travelled about, conquering by an effort his great bodily infirmities, and the living word from his lips produced even mightier effects than his letters.† A peculiar charm, and a peculiar power of moving men's minds, must have existed in the tones of his voice; to this must be added the awe-inspiring effect of his whole appearance, the way in which his whole being and the motions of his bodily frame joined in testifying of that which seized and inspired him. Thus it admits of being explained how, in Germany, even those who understood but little or in fact nothing of what he said, could be so moved as to shed tears and smite their breasts; could, by his own speeches in a foreign language, be more strongly affected and agitated than by the immediate interpretation of his words by another.‡ From all quarters sick persons were conveyed to him by the friends who sought from him a cure; and the power of his faith, the confidence he inspired in the minds of men, might sometimes produce remarkable effects.§ With this enthusiasm, however, Bernard united a degree of prudence and a discernment of character such as few of that age possessed, and such qualities were required to counteract the multiform excitements of the wild spirit of fanaticism which mixed in with this great ferment of minds. Thus, he warned the Germans not to suffer them-

\* Gerhoh of Reichersberg writes, a year after this: *Certatim curritur ad bellum sanctum cum jubilantibus tubis argenteis, Papa Eugenio Tertio, et ejus Nuntiis, quorum precipuus est Abbas Clarevallensis, quorum prædicationibus contonantibus et miraculis nonnullis pariter coruscantibus terræ motus factus est magnus.* In Ps. xxxi. ed. Pez. L. c. f. 792.

† How great was the force of his eloquence, says the abbot Gottfried, l. c. c. 4, f. 1119: *Nosse poterunt aliquatenus, qui ipsius legerint scripta, etsi longe minus ab eis, qui verba ejus sæpius audierunt. Siquidem diffusa erat gratia in labiis ejus et ignitum eloquium ejus vehementer, ut non posset ne ipsius quidem stilus, licet eximius, totam illam dulcedinem, totum retinere fervorem.*

‡ *Verborum ejus magis sentire virtutem,* says the biographer named in the preceding note.

§ Of which we shall say more farther on.

selves to be misled so far as to follow certain independent enthusiasts, ignorant of war, who were bent on moving forward the bodies of the crusaders prematurely. He held up as a warning the example of Peter the Hermit, and declared himself very decidedly opposed to the proposition of an abbot who was disposed to march with a number of monks to Jerusalem; "For," said he, "fighting warriors are more needed there than singing monks."\* At an assembly held at Chartres, it was proposed that he himself should take the lead of the expedition; but he rejected the proposition at once, declaring that it was beyond his power, and contrary to his calling.† Having, perhaps, reason to fear that the pope might be hurried on, by the shouts of the many, to lay upon him some charge to which he did not feel himself called, he besought the pope that he would not make him a victim to men's arbitrary will, but that he would inquire, as it was his duty to do, how God had determined to dispose of him.‡ We have already narrated, on a former page, how Bernard succeeded in assuaging the popular fury against the Jews.

With the preaching of this second crusade, as with the invitation to the first, was connected an extraordinary awakening. Many who had hitherto given themselves up to their unrestrained passions and desires, and become strangers to all higher feelings, were seized with compunction. Bernard's call to repentance penetrated many a heart: people who had lived in all manner of crime, were seen following this voice, and flocking together in troops to receive the badge of the cross. Bishop Otto of Freisingen, the historian, who himself took the cross at that time, expresses it as his opinion, "That every man of sound understanding would be forced to acknowledge so sudden and uncommon a change could have been produced in no other way than by the right hand of the Lord."§ The

\* Plus illic milites pugnantes, quam monachos cantantes necessarios esse. Ep. 359.

† Ep. 256, to pope Eugene the Third: Quis sum ego, ut disponam castrorum acies, ut egrediar ante facies armatorum? Aut quid tam remotum a professione mea, etiam si vires suppetere, etiam si peritia non deesset.

‡ Ne me humanis voluntatibus exponatis, sed, sicut singulariter vobis incumbit, divinum consilium perquiratis.

§ De gestis Frederici I. c. 40: Tanta, mirum dictu, prædonum et

provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg, who wrote in the midst of these movements, was persuaded that he saw here a work of the Holy Spirit, designed to counteract the vices and corruptions which had got the upper hand in the church.\* Many who had been awakened to repentance, confessed what they had taken from others by robbery or fraud, and hastened, before they went to the holy war, to seek reconciliation with their enemies.† The Christian enthusiasm of the German people found utterance in songs in the German tongue; and even now the peculiar adaptation of this language to sacred poetry began to be remarked. Indecent songs could no longer venture to appear abroad.‡

While some were awakened by Bernard's preaching from a life of crime to repentance, and by taking part in the holy war strove to obtain the remission of their sins; others, again, who though hitherto borne along in the current of ordinary worldly pursuits, yet had not given themselves up to vice, were filled by Bernard's words with loathing of the worldly life, inflamed with a vehement longing after a higher stage of Christian perfection, after a life of entire consecration to God. They longed rather to enter upon the pilgrimage to the heavenly, than to an earthly Jerusalem; they resolved to become monks, and would fain have the man of God himself, whose words had made so deep an impression on their hearts, as their guide in

latronum advolabat multitudo, ut nullus sani capitis hanc tam subitam, quam insolitam mutationem ex dextera excelsi pervenire non cognosceret.

\* His remarkable words are: Post hæc invalescente multimoda impietate ac multiplicatis in ecclesia vel mundo fornicatoribus, raptoribus, homicidis, perjuris, incendiariis non solum in sæculo, sed etiam in domo Dei, quam fecerunt speluncam latronum, ego ecclesia (personification of the church) expectavi Dominum et intendit mihi et exaudivit preces meas, quia ecce dum hæc scribimus, contra nequitias et impietates manifestum spiritus pietatis opus in ecclesia Dei videmus. In Ps. xxxix. L. c. f. 792.

† Multi ex iis primitus ablata seu fraudata restitunt et, quod majus est, exemplo Christi suis inimicis osculum pacis offerunt, injurias ignoscunt. L. c.

‡ Gerhoh's noticeable words: In ore Christo militantium Laicorum laus Dei crebrescit, quia non est in toto regno Christiano, qui turpes cantilenas cantare in publico audeat, sed tota terra jubilat in Christi laudibus, etiam per cantilenas linguæ vulgaris, maxime in Teutonicis, quorum lingua magis apta est concinnis canticis. L. c. f. 794.

the spiritual life, and commit themselves to his directions, in the monastery of Clairvaux. But here Bernard showed his prudence and knowledge of mankind; he did not allow all to become monks who wished to do so. Many he rejected because he perceived they were not fitted for the quiet of the contemplative life, but needed to be disciplined by the conflicts and cares of a life of action.\*

But we here have occasion to repeat the same remark which we made in speaking of the first crusade. As contemporaries themselves acknowledge, these first impressions in the case of many who went to the crusades, were of no permanent duration, and their old nature broke forth again the more strongly under the manifold temptations to which they were exposed, in proportion to the facility with which, through the confidence they reposed in a plenary indulgence, without really laying to heart the condition upon which it was bestowed, they could flatter themselves with security in their sins. Gerhoh of Reichersberg, in describing the blessed effects of that awakening which accompanied the preaching of the crusader, yet says, "We doubt not that among so vast a multitude, some became in the true sense and in all sincerity soldiers of Christ. Some, however, were led to embark in the enterprise by various other occasions, concerning whom it does not belong *to us* to judge, but only *to Him* who alone knows the hearts of those who marched to the contest either in the right or not in the right spirit. Yet this we do confidently affirm, that to this crusade many were called, but few were chosen."† And it was said

\* The monk Cesarius, of the monastery of Heisterbach, near Cologne, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, relates this in his dialogues, which, amidst much that is fabulous, contains a rich store of facts relating to the history of Christian life in this period. L. c. vi. for instance, concerning the effects of the preaching of the crusades in Liege. When Bernard preached a crusading sermon at Costnitz, his words made such an impression on Henry, a very wealthy and powerful knight, the owner of several castles, that he wished to become a monk, and he was encouraged in this by Bernard. He at once became the latter's companion, and, as he understood both the French and the German languages, acted as his interpreter. But when one of the soldiers in the service of the said knight proposed also to become a monk, Bernard declined to receive him, and exhorted him rather to take part in the crusade. L. c.

† Et quidem non dubitamus in tanta multitudine quosdam vere ac sincere Christo militare, quosdam vero per occasiones varias, quos dijudicare non est nostrum, sed ipsius, qui solus novit corda hominum sive



that many returned from this expedition not better but worse than they went.\* Therefore the monk Cesarius of Heisterbach, who states this, adds : “ All depends on bearing the yoke of Christ not *one* year or *two* years, but daily,—if a man is really intent on doing it in truth, and in that sense in which our Lord requires it to be done, and as it must be done, in order to follow him.”

When it turned out, however, that the event did not answer the expectations excited by Bernard's enthusiastic confidence, but the crusade came to that unfortunate issue which was brought about especially by the treachery of the princes and nobles of the Christian kingdom in Syria, this was a source of great chagrin to Bernard, who had been so active in setting it in motion, and who had inspired such confident hopes by his promises. He appeared now in the light of a bad prophet, and he was reproached by many with having incited men to engage in an enterprise which had cost so much blood to no purpose ; † but Bernard's friends alleged, in his defence, that he had not excited such a popular movement single-handed, but as the organ of the pope, in whose name he acted ; and they appealed to the facts by which his preaching of the cross was proved to be a work of God,—to the wonders which attended it. ‡ Or they ascribed the failure of the undertaking to the bad conduct of the crusaders themselves, to the unchristian mode of life which many of them led, as one of these friends maintained, in a consoling letter to Bernard himself, § adding, “ God, however, has turned it into good. Numbers who, if they had returned

recte sive non recte militantium. Hoc tamen constanter affirmamus, quod multi ad hanc militiam vocati, pauci vero electi sunt. L. c. f. 793.

\* Multi post peregrinationes deteriores fiunt et pristinis vitiis amplius se involvunt. Cesar. Heisterb. l. c. 6.

† Gottfried, in his life of Bernard, says (c. 4) : Nec tacendum, quod ex predicatione itineris Hierosolymitani grave contra eum quorundam hominum vel simplicitas vel malignitas scandalum sumpsit, cum tristior sequeretur effectus.

‡ Evidenter enim verbum hoc prædicavit, Domino cooperante et sermonem confirmante sequentibus signis ; so says the biographer mentioned in the preceding note.

§ See ep. 386. The abbot, who was the writer of this letter, relates that many who had returned from Palestine stated, quod vidissent multos ibi morientes, qui libenter se mori dicebant neque velle reverti, ne amplius in peccatis reciderent.

home, would have continued to live a life of crime, disciplined and purified by many sufferings, have passed into the life eternal." But Bernard himself could not be staggered in his faith by this event. In writing to pope Eugene on this subject,\* he refers to the incomprehensibility of the divine ways and judgments; to the example of Moses, who, although his work carried on its face incontestable evidence of being a work of God, yet was not permitted himself to conduct the Jews into the promised land. As this was owing to the fault of the Jews themselves, so too the crusaders had none to blame but themselves for the failure of the divine work;† "But," says he, "it will be said, perhaps, How do we know that this work came from the Lord? What miracle dost thou work that we should believe thee? To this question I need not give an answer; it is a point on which my modesty asks to be excused from speaking. Do you answer," says he to the pope, "for me and for yourself, according to that which you have seen and heard;" so firmly was Bernard convinced that God had sustained his labours by miracles.

Eugene was at length enabled, in the year 1149, after having for a long time excited against himself the indignation of the cardinals by his dependence on the French abbot, with the assistance of Roger king of the Sicilies, to return to Rome; where, however, he still had to maintain a struggle with the party of Arnold. The provost Gerhoh finds something to complain of, in the fact that the church of St. Peter wore so warlike an aspect that men beheld the tomb of the apostle surrounded with bastions and the implements of war!§

As Bernard was no longer sufficiently near the pope to exert on him the same immediate personal influence as in times past, he addressed to him a voice of admonition and warning, such

\* Considerat. L. II. in the beginning.

† Quod si illi (Judæi) ceciderunt et perierunt propter iniquitatem suam, miramur istos eadem facientes eadem passos?

‡ Responde tu pro me et pro te ipso, secundum ea quæ audisti et vidisti.

§ Non immerito dolemus, quod adhuc in domo b. Petri desolationis abominationem stare videmus, positis etiam propugnaculis et aliis bellorum instrumentis in altitudine sanctuarii supra corpus b. Petri. Quod licet non audeamus judicare malum esse tamen sine dubio judicamus esse a malo, eorum videlicet, qui suæ rebellionis malitia cogunt fieri talia. In Ps. lxiv. f. 1181.

as the mighty of the earth seldom enjoy the privilege of hearing. With the frankness of a love, which, as he himself expresses it, knew not the master, but recognized the son, even under the pontifical robes,\* he set before him, in his four books † “On Meditation” (*De Consideratione*), which he sent to him singly at different times, the duties of his office, and the faults against which, in order to fulfil these duties, he needed especially to guard. Bernard was penetrated with a conviction that to the pope, as St. Peter's successor, was committed by God a sovereign power of church-government over all, and responsible to no other tribunal; that to this church theocracy, guided by the pope, the administration even of the secular power, though independent within its own peculiar sphere, should be subjected, for the service of the kingdom of God; but he also perceived, with the deepest pain, how very far the papacy was from corresponding to this its idea and destination; what prodigious corruption had sprung and continued to spring from the abuse of papal authority; he perceived already, with prophetic eye, that this very abuse of arbitrary will must eventually bring about the destruction of this power. He desired that the pope should disentangle himself from the secular part of his office, and reduce that office within the purely spiritual domain; and that, above all, he should learn to govern and restrict himself. “From neither poison nor sword,” wrote he to him, “do I so much dread danger to thee, as from the love of rule.” ‡ He reminded him of the shameful, spirit-depressing slavery which he endured from all quarters under the show of rule,—he must be servant, not of an individual, but of all. Nor could he rightly appeal to that saying of the apostle Paul, that he made himself the servant of all men, while the ambitious, the seekers of gain, the practisers of simony, the incontinent, and such like monsters, from the whole world, flocked to the pope, seeking to acquire or to preserve, by his apostolical authority, the places of honour in the church. That apostle, to whom to live was Christ, and to die was gain, made himself a servant to men, in order that

\* His words in the prologue to the work: *De consideratione*: *Amor Dominum nescit, agnoscit filium et in infulis.*

† Of the fifth, we shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

‡ *Nullum tibi venenum, nullum gladium plus formido, quam libidinem dominandi.* Lib. III. c. 1.

he might win more souls to Christ, not in order to increase the emoluments of cupidity. Much rather should he ponder that saying of the same apostle: Ye are bought with a price, be not the servants of men. "What is more a servitude, what is more unworthy a pope, than that thou shouldst busy thyself almost every hour with such things and for the advantage of such men? Finally, when is there time for prayer, to instruct the congregation, to edify the church, to meditate on the divine law? And yet we must admit that the laws do daily make themselves to be heard in the papal palace; but what laws? the laws of Justinian, not those of the Lord." Gladly would he invite him, according to 2 Timothy ii. 4, to put far from him all these secular affairs, so alien from his spiritual office, but he is very sensible that the times were not capable of receiving such truths. "Believest thou that these times would bear it, if thou shouldst repel those people who are contending about an earthly inheritance, and seek a decision from thee, with the words of thy Master: Man, who has made me a judge over you? How instantly would they accuse thee of dishonouring thy primacy, and surrendering somewhat of the apostolical dignity; and yet it is my opinion, that those who so speak cannot mention the place where any one of the apostles ever held a trial, decided disputes about boundaries, or portioned out lands. I read, indeed, that the apostles stood before judgment-seats, but not that they sat upon them." This, he said, was not belittling the papal dignity or authority; on the contrary, he held it to be so exalted as to be able to dispense with managing such worldly affairs. "Your authority has reference to sins, not to earthly possessions. On account of the former, not the latter, have you received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, with power to exclude men from it on account of their sins, not on account of their possessions. These earthly things have also *their* judges, the kings and princes of the world. Why intrude into another's province?"\* He laments that the pope's appearance, mode of living, and occupations, so little comported with the office of spiritual shepherd. He laments the arrogance and superior airs affected

\* *Habent hæc infima et terrena iudices suos, reges et principes terræ. Quid fines alienos invaditis? Quid falcem vestram in alienam messem extenditis?*

by his attendants.\* He labours to impress him, above all, with the duty of exercising his spiritual office as amongst that intractable, corrupt people, the Romans, who stood in especial need of it; at least to make the experiment, whether something could not be done for their conversion, and these wolves turned into lambs. "Here," said he, "*I* do not spare thee, in order that *God* may spare thee. Deny that thou art the *pastor*, the *shepherd* of this people, or prove thyself to be such. Thou wilt not *deny* it, lest he whose episcopal seat thou possessest, deny thee as his heir. It is *that* Peter, of whom it is not known that he was ever loaded with precious stones or silks, conveyed about covered with gold on a white horse, surrounded by soldiers and bustling servants. In these things thou hast not followed Peter, but Constantine." He advises him, if he must endure such marks of honour for a short time, yet to put in no claim to them, but rather seek to fulfil the duties belonging to his vocation. "Though thou walkest abroad clad in purple and gold, yet as thou art heir of the shepherd, shrink not from the shepherd's toils and cares; thou hast no reason to be ashamed of the gospel." Not the earthly sword, but the sword of the word should be used by him against the unruly Romans. "Why dost thou again unsheath the sword which the Lord has bid thee put up in its sheath? True, it is evident from this command, that it is *thy* sword still; but one which is to be drawn at thy bidding only, not by thy hand. Else, when Peter said, Here are two swords, our Lord would not have answered, It is enough: but there are too many; therefore both swords, the spiritual and the temporal, are to serve the church; but the first is *for* the church; the second also, from the church: the first is wielded by the hand of the priest; the second, in the hand of the soldier, at the beck of the pope, by the command of the emperor." It was then Bernard's idea that, although the pope busies himself directly only with spiritual matters, yet he should exercise a sort of superintendence also over the administration of the secular authority.

But while he recognizes the church government of the pope as one to which all others, without exception, are subjected,

\* Ita omne humile probro ducitur inter Palatinos, ut facilius qui esse, quam qui apparere humilis velit, invenias.

he advises that he should restrict himself; that he should respect the other authorities existing in the church, and not usurp the whole to himself. He presents before him the great evil which must necessarily result from multiplied and arbitrary exemptions; the murmurings and complaints of the churches, which sighed over their mutilations; hence so much squandering of church property, destruction of church order, and so many schisms. If his authority was the highest ordained of God, yet he should not for that reason suppose it the only one ordained of God. The text, Rom. xiii. 1, which was often misinterpreted and abused by the defenders of absolute arbitrary will, Bernard turns against them. "Though the passage, 'Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God,' serves *thy* purpose especially, yet it does not serve it exclusively. The same apostle says: 'Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers;' he speaks not of one, but of several. It is not thy authority alone, therefore, that is from the Lord, but this is true also of the intermediate, of the lower powers. And, since what God has put together, man should not put asunder; so neither should man level down what God has put in a relation of supra-ordination and subordination. Thou produceest a monster, if thou disseverest the finger from the hand, and makest it hang directly from the head. So is it, too, if thou arrangest the members in the body of Christ in a different order from that in which he himself has placed them." He refers to the order instituted by Christ himself, 1 Corinth. xii. 28; Ephes. iv. 16. He refers to the system of appeals, so ruinous to the condition of the church, as an example suited to show the direct tendency of the abuse of the papal authority to bring it into contempt, and also that the pope would take the best and surest means of meeting the latter evil by checking the former.\* He warns the pope, by pointing him to God's judgments in history: "*Once make the trial of uniting both together; try to be ruler and at the same time successor of the apostle, or to be the apostle's successor*

\* Lib. III. cap. ii. s. 12. Videris tu, quid sibi velit, quod zelus vester assidue pæne vindicat illam (contemptum), istam (usurpationem) dissipulat. Vis perfectius coercere contemptum? Cura in ipso utero pessimæ matris præfocari germen nequam, quod ita fiet, si usurpatio digna animadversione muletetur. Tolle usurpationem, et contemptus excusationem non habet.

*and at the same time ruler. You must let go of one or the other. If you attempt to secure both at once, you will lose both.*" He commends to his consideration the threatening language of the prophet, Hosea viii. 4.\*

But to the close of his life, in the year 1153, pope Eugene had to contend with the turbulent spirit of the Romans and the influences of the principles disseminated by Arnold; and this contest was prolonged into the reign of his second successor, Adrian the fourth. Among the people and among the nobles, a considerable party had arisen, who would concede to the pope no kind of secular dominion. And there seems to have been a shade of difference among the members of this party. A mob of the people† is said to have gone to such an extreme of arrogance as to propose the choosing of a new emperor from amongst the Romans themselves, the restoration of a Roman empire independent of the pope. The other party, to which belonged the nobles, were for placing the emperor Frederic the First at the head of the Roman republic, and uniting themselves with him in a common interest against the pope. They invited him‡ to receive the imperial crown, in the ancient manner, from the "Senate and Roman people," and not from the heretical and recreant clergy, and the false monks, who acted in contradiction to their calling, exercising lordship despite of the evangelical and apostolical doctrine; and in contempt of all laws, divine and human, brought the church of God and the kingdom of the world into confusion. Those who pretend that they are the representatives of Peter, it was said, in a letter addressed in the spirit of this party to the emperor Frederic the First, "act in contradiction to the doctrines which that apostle teaches in his epistles. How can they say with the apostle Peter, 'Lo, we have left all and followed thee,' and, 'Silver and gold have I none?'" How can our

\* Lib. II. c. vi. s. 11. I ergo tu et tibi usurpare aude aut dominans apostolatum aut apostolicus dominatum. Plane ab alterutro prohiberis. Si utrumque simul habere voles, perdes utrumque. Alioquin non te exceptum illorum numero putes, de quibus queritur Deus. Osea viii. 4.

† Rusticana quedam turba absque nobilium et majorum scientia, as pope Eugenius himself writes. Martene et Durand, Collectio amplissima, T. II. f. 554.

‡ See the letter written in the name of this party, and expressing its views, by a certain Wezel, to the emperor Frederic the First, in the year 1152, in the collection mentioned in the note preceding, T. II. f. 554.

Lord say to such, 'Ye are the light of the world,' 'the salt of the earth?' Much rather is to be applied to them what our Lord says of the salt that has lost its savour. Eager after earthly riches, they spoil the true riches, from which the salvation of the world has proceeded. How can the saying be applied to them, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit;' for they are neither poor in spirit nor in fact?"

Pope Adrian the Fourth was first enabled, under more favourable circumstances, and assisted by the emperor Frederic the First,\* to deprive the Arnold party of its leader, and then to suppress it entirely. It so happened that, in the first year of Adrian's reign, 1155, a cardinal, on his way to visit the pope, was attacked and wounded by followers of Arnold. This induced the pope to put all Rome under the interdict, with a view to force the expulsion of Arnold and his party. This means did not fail of its effect. The people, who could not bear the suspension of divine worship, now themselves compelled the nobles to bring about the ejection of Arnold and his friends. Arnold, on leaving Rome, found protection from Italian nobles. By the order, however, of the emperor Frederic, who had come into Italy, he was torn from his protectors, and surrendered up to the papal authority. The prefect of Rome then took possession of his person, and caused him to be hung. His body was burned, and its ashes thrown into the Tiber, lest his bones might be preserved as the relics of a martyr by the Romans, who were enthusiastically devoted to him.† Worthly men, who were in other respects zealous defenders of the church orthodoxy and of the hierarchy, as, for example, Gerhoh of Reichersberg, expressed their disapprobation, first, that Arnold should be punished with death on account of the errors which he disseminated; secondly, that the sentence of death should proceed from a *spiritual* tribunal, or

\* Pope Eugene had taken advantage of the above-mentioned plan of one portion of Arnold's party to represent that party to the emperor as detrimental even to the imperial interests. The words of Eugene, in the letter already mentioned in a preceding note addressed to the emperor's envoy, the abbot Wibald, are: Quod quia contra coronam regni et carissimi filii nostri. Friderici Romanorum regis, honorem attentare præsumunt, eidem volumus per te secretius nuntiari.

† See Acta Vaticana, in Baronius, annal. ad a. 1155, No. I. et IV., and Otto of Freisingen de gestis, f. 1, <sup>1</sup> ii. c. xx.



that such a tribunal should at least have subjected itself to that bad appearance. But on the part of the Roman court it was alleged, in defence of this proceeding, that "it was done without the knowledge and contrary to the will of the Roman curia." "The prefect of Rome had forcibly removed Arnold from the prison where he was kept, and his servants had put him to death in revenge for injuries they had suffered from Arnold's party. Arnold, therefore, was executed, not on account of his doctrines, but in consequence of tumults excited by himself." It may be a question whether this was said with sincerity, or whether, according to the proverb, a confession of guilt is not implied in the excuse. But Gerhof was of the opinion that in this case they should at least have done as David did, in the case of Abner's death (2 Sam. iii.), and, by allowing Arnold to be buried, and his death to be mourned over, instead of causing his body to be burned, and the remains thrown into the Tiber, washed their hands of the whole transaction.\*

But the idea for which Arnold had contended, and for which he died, continued to work in various forms, even after his death,—the idea of a purification of the church from the foreign worldly elements with which it had become vitiated, of its restoration to its original spiritual character. Even the person who had given over Arnold to the power of his enemies, must afterwards attach himself—though induced by motives of

\* Gerhof's noticeable words concerning Arnold: *Quem ego vellem pro tali doctrina sua, quamvis prava, vel exilio vel carcere aut alia pœna præter mortem punitum esse vel saltem taliter occisum, ut Romana ecclesia seu curia ejus necis quæstione careret. Nam, sicut ajunt, absque ipsorum scientia et consensu a præfecto urbis Romæ de sub eorum custodia, in qua tenebatur, ereptus ac pro speciali causa occisus ab ejus servis est; maximam siquidem cladem ex occasione ejusdem doctrinæ (in which, therefore, it seems to be implied, that Arnold's principles had only given occasion to the tumult, not that he himself had created it), idem præfectus a Romanis civibus perpeßus fuerat; quare non saltem ab occisi crematione ac submersione ejus occisores metuerunt? Quatenus a domo sacerdotali sanguinis quæstio remota esset, sicut David quondam honestas Abner exequias providit atque ante ipsas flevit, ut sanguinem fraudulentè effusum a domo ac throno suo removeret. Sed de his ipsi viderint. Nihil enim super his nostra interest, nisi cupere matri nostræ, sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ id quod bonum justum et honestum est. It was important for him to make this declaration: ne videatur neci ejus perperam actæ assensum præbere. See Gretser's Werke, T. XII. in the prolegomena to the writings against the Waldenses, f. 12.*

a different kind, by the interests of politics—to a tendency of this sort. With this emperor begins a new epoch in the history of the papacy,—the hundred years controversy of the popes with the emperors of the Hohenstaufen family. It was not, as formerly, the contests of the pope with princes who stood singly opposed to him, and acted rather by momentary interests than according to a fixed plan; but a contest, which was perseveringly maintained by three princes, following one after the other in immediate succession, with all the power, energy, and craft of a consistent plan,—which, after every momentary pause occasioned by particular circumstances, was resumed with the same vigour as before. Here it was to be decided whether the papacy could be overturned by any force from without, or must only come forth triumphant out of such a conflict.

When Frederic came into Italy for the first time, and Rome was already filled with alarm, the issue showed that these fears were groundless. The emperor sought to maintain a good understanding with the pope,—whether it was that he had it in view to establish his power on a firm footing in Italy, before he embarked in this dangerous contest, or that he was disposed to try whether he might not obtain the pope's co-operation in accomplishing his objects.\* If the latter was his plan, he must at least have soon convinced himself that this thing was impossible. The churchly theocratical system could tolerate *no* power beside itself; but it required of every other unconditional subjection. Its unyielding pretensions Frederic soon came to find out, in disputing the question whether he was bound to hold the stirrup for the pope,† and in beholding those pictures and

\* The remarkable words of John of Salisbury, who to be sure was very hostilely disposed towards the imperial interest, are (ep. 59): *Scio quid Teutonicus molitur. Erant enim Romæ præsidente b. Eugenio, quando prima legatione missa in regni sui initio, tanti ausi impudentiam, tumor intolerabilis, lingua incauta detexit. Promittebat enim, se totius orbis reformaturum imperium, urbi subjiendum orbem, eventusque facili omnia subacturum, si ei ad hoc solius Romani pontificis favor adesset. Id enim agebat, ut in quemcunque demutatis inimicitis materialem gladium imperator, in eundem Romanus pontifex spiritualem gladium exereret.* Therefore, the idea of universal politico-spiritual monarchy.

† The fabulous story was handed round that the emperor Constantine had done this act of homage to pope Silvester, and good use was made of it in an uncritical age. We take this from Gerhoh's words, in his

inscriptions in the papal palaces, which represented the pope as liege-lord of the empire.\*

The resolution was now matured in the emperor's mind that he would take advantage of the first opportunity to resist these papal pretensions. Such an opportunity was soon furnished, perhaps undesignedly, by the pope himself. A bishop of Lund, in Sweden, when returning from a pilgrimage to Rome, was robbed and taken captive by certain German knights. The pope complained to the emperor in a letter, of the year 1157, that he had let this offence go unpunished, and had not taken the side of the bishop. He reminded him of the gratitude which he owed to the papal chair, of the services which that chair had rendered him during his stay at Rome, and mentioned; among other particulars, the *bestowment of the imperial crown*, as if this depended on the pope's determination.† Still, he added, the pope would not have regretted it, had he received, if that were possible, still greater benefits from him.‡

Syntagma de statu ecclesiæ, c. xxiv. Gretser, T. VI. fol. 258: Cui ad honoris cumulum et ipse Constantinus tenens frenum per civitatem stratoris officium exhibuit. In another place, Gerloh extols this triumph of the hierarchy in the following noticeable words: Regnis idololatriæ, schismaticis atque indisciplinatis usque ad sui fastus defectum curvatis amplius glorificanda et coronanda erat sacerdotalis dignitas, ita ut stratoris quoque officium pontifici Romano a regibus et imperatoribus exhibendum sit. In him we have a strikingly characteristic representative of the spirit of this party, when intoxicated by his enthusiasm for the universally triumphant priesthood he sees in the future a goal to be reached, where small princes of inferior name should arise in place of the imperial dignity; princes who could undertake nothing in opposition to the church. Hæc nimirum spectacula (says he, after the passage just cited), nunc regibus partim ablatis, partim diminuto eorum regno humilitatis, et exaltato sacerdotio delectant spectatorem benevolum, torquent invidum, qui ut amplius crucietur et pius oculus magis jucundetur, etc., succedet in sæculari dignitate minoris nominis potestas diminutis regnis magnis in tretrarchias aut minores etiam particulas. ne premere valeant ecclesias et ecclesiasticas personas. In Ps. lxxiv. l. c. f. 1190.

\* To paintings which symbolically represented the principles of the papal system, John of Salisbury also alludes, in the letter already referred to; Sic ad gloriam patrum teste Lateranensi palatio, ubi hoc invisibilibus picturis et laici legunt, ad gloriam patrum schismatici, quos sæcularis potestas intrusit, dantur pontificibus pro scabello.

† Quantam tibi (Romana ecclesia) dignitatis plenitudinem contulerit et honoris et qualiter imperialis insigne coronæ libentissime conferens.

‡ Si majora beneficia excellentia tua de manu nostra suscepisset, si fieri posset.

When this was read before the emperor, in the diet held at Besançon, it produced a strong and universal movement of surprise. Not without reason might offence be taken at the language in which the pope spoke of the bestowment of the imperial crown; and—by putting this in conjunction with what was said about benefits, the emperor recollecting all the while those pictures and inscriptions which he had seen at Rome,\* the worst construction which could be put on the word "*beneficium*," according to the use of language in that period, as designating a feoffage, was put upon the pope's language, though the connection was decidedly against any such construction. The papal legates, who had brought the letter, were little fitted by their temper to quiet the excited feelings of the assembly. One of them, Cardinal Roland of Siena, chancellor of the church of Rome, on offence being taken at those words of the papal letter, had the boldness to ask, "From whom then did the emperor obtain the government, if not from the pope?" These words produced such an outburst of anger, that a terrible vengeance would have lighted on the head of the speaker, if he had not been protected by the emperor. The legates were dismissed with disgrace; they were commanded to return immediately to Rome, and to visit no bishop or abbot by the way, lest, in travelling about the empire, they might find opportunity of creating disturbances, or of exacting contributions.† For the same reason, the emperor laid a restriction

\* The picture of the emperor Lothaire the Second, on whom the pope bestows the imperial crown, with the inscription:—

Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores  
Post homo fit Papæ, sumit quo dante coronam.

According to the account of the historian Radwic (i. 10), the pope had promised, in reply to the friendly remonstrances of the emperor, that this picture should be removed.

† The words in the emperor's letter, in which he notices this, and explains his motives: Porro quia multa paria literarum apud eos reperta sunt et schedulæ sigillatæ ad arbitrium eorum adhuc scribendæ (namely, blank leaves to which the pope's seal had been affixed, which they were to fill up according to circumstances; so great was the power intrusted to them), quibus sicut hactenus consuetudinis eorum fuit, per singulas ecclesias Teutonici regni conceptum iniquitatis suæ virus respergere, altaria denudare, vasa domus Dei apportare, cires excoriare nitabantur. A description of the exactions made by the papal legates, which we assuredly cannot regard as exaggerated, judging from a comparison with other accounts of these times.

upon that constant and lively intercourse which had been hitherto kept up between Germany and Rome, by means of pilgrimages and appeals. He endeavoured to provide that his conduct towards the pope should everywhere be seen in a favourable point of light. He therefore caused to be published throughout the whole empire, a document setting forth what had been done, and the reasons which made it necessary to take such a course. In this paper he styled himself, in opposition to the papal pretensions, "the Lord's anointed," who had obtained the government from that almighty power from which proceeds all authority in heaven and on earth. "Since our government," he declared, "proceeds, through the choice of the princes, from God alone ; since our Lord, at his passion, committed the government of the world to two swords, and since the apostle Peter gave to the world this precept, 'Fear God, and honour the king,' it is evident, that whoever says, 'we received the imperial crown as a *beneficium* from the pope,' contradicts the divine order and the doctrine of Peter, and makes himself guilty of a lie." The pope, first in a letter issued to the German bishops, complained bitterly of this procedure on the part of the emperor, and called upon them to use the influence they had with him, to bring him to his senses. But the bishops were here of one and the same mind with the emperor ; they handed over this letter to him, and he communicated to them the draft of a reply which he intended for the pope. In this, he declared that he was ready to pay all due respect to the head of the church ; but he was also resolved to maintain the independence of his imperial throne. "It was by no means," he said, "his design to hinder those who wished, from making the pilgrimage to Rome, or from visiting that city for any other good reasons ; but he only intended to resist those abuses of which he could justly say, that all the churches of his empire were burdened with them, and all the discipline of the monasteries destroyed by them."\* "In the head city of the world," he writes, "God exalted the church by means of the empire ; in the head city of the world, the church now seeks, not through God, as we think, to destroy the empire.

\* Illis abusionibus, quibus omnes ecclesiæ regni nostri gravatæ et attentatæ sunt et omnes pæne claustrales disciplinæ emortuæ et sepultæ, obviare intendimus.

She began with pictures; from pictures she proceeded to writings; these writings would procure for themselves the authority of the law. Sooner will we lay down our crown, than suffer it, together with ourselves, to be so degraded. The pictures must be destroyed; the writings must be revoked, so that the monuments of the controversy between the empire and the priesthood may not last for ever.”\* The bishops, in transmitting this declaration of the emperor to the pope, assured him that those words of his own letter had excited the greatest displeasure amongst all the German princes, as well as in the emperor; that they themselves could not defend those words because of their ambiguity. They represented to him the great danger which might grow out of this dispute, and besought him earnestly, that he would seek to pacify the emperor by a conciliatory letter.

As the emperor now marched into Italy with an army, fear added weight, in the pope's mind, to the representations of the bishops. He sent a second legation to the emperor, for which he selected two cardinals who were free from that hierarchical obstinacy, and adroit men of the world. These envoys handed over to the emperor another letter, which, by a milder explanation of those words which had given offence, was designed to pacify him. Against the construction which the emperor had put on the word *beneficium*, he could easily defend himself, by an appeal to etymology, to the common Latin *usus loquendi*, and at the same time to the Bible.† In respect also to the other difficulty, he maintained that this language had been misconstrued, but without entering into more distinct explanations.‡

Thus, for the present, the good understanding between the emperor and the pope was again restored; still, however, in a case where interests and principles were so directly opposed, this could not last long; and the sojourn of the emperor in Italy, in the year 1158, where with good success he was seeking to establish his power on a firm foundation, could not fail

\* *Picturæ deleantur, scripturæ retractentur, ut inter regnum et sacerdotium æternæ inimicitiarum monumenta non remaneant.*

† *Hoc nomen ex bono et facto est editum et dicitur beneficium apud nos non feudum, sed bonum factum.*

‡ *Per hoc vocabulum (the offensive word “contulimus”), nihil aliud intelleximus, nisi quod superius dictum est imposuimus.*

to produce many a collision between the two. The pope could not pardon it in the emperor, that he insisted on his right of sovereignty over the city of Rome, caused the bishops to take the oath of allegiance, placed a limit on appeals to Rome, and sought to check the influence of the papal legates in Germany. In this uneasy state of feeling, he wrote to the emperor a short letter, complaining of his want of respect to the apostle Peter and to the church of Rome. What arrogance was it, that in his letter to the pope, he should place his own name before that of the pope. How grossly he violated the fidelity vowed to St. Peter, when he required of those who are all gods and sons of the Highest, the oath of allegiance, and took their holy hands into his. He reproached him with having shut out the churches and states of his empire from the papal legates. He exhorted him to repentance. In the reply to this letter a mode of thinking expressed itself, which required the separation of spiritual things from secular, in the case of the church of Rome as well as of other churches. The very superscription itself plainly indicated the emperor's views, in the wish there expressed that he might remain faithful and true to all that Jesus had taught by word and deed. He denied that the popes held worldly possessions by divine right; they were indebted for all they possessed to the donations of monarchs, as Sylvester first had received all he possessed from the emperor Constantine. It was by ancient right that, in his letters to the pope, he placed his own name first; and the pope was free to do the same thing in writing to the emperor. He acknowledged the higher consecrated character of the bishops; but it seemed to him not in the least incompatible with this, that he should require them to take the oath of allegiance; and he appeals to the pattern of Christ: "Whereas your Master and mine, who needed not that anything should be given him by a king who was a man, but bestows every good upon all, paid for himself and Peter the tribute-money to Cæsar, and also set the example of so acting, when he said, 'Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart,' so you therefore should leave to us the regalia,—or, if you expect to derive advantage from it, you should 'render to God the things that are God's, and to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.'" The churches and countries he had shut out from the cardinals because they did not come to preach, to make

and to establish peace, but to plunder, and to gratify their insatiable cupidity. Should such men come, however, as the good of the church required that bishops should be, he would not delay providing them with everything needful. The emperor asked the pope to consider how incongruous it was with the humility and meekness of which, as Christ's vicegerent, he should set the example, for him to excite disputes about such things; and in what an unfavourable light he must place himself thereby before the eyes of the world! After long-continued negotiations, the dispute between the pope and the emperor was as far from being settled as ever. Already was Adrian on the point of proceeding to more violent measures against that monarch, when, precisely at this critical moment, in the year 1159, he died.

The death of Adrian at this point of time was necessarily followed by a schism in the choice of a pope; for there were, as usual, two parties among the cardinals; one, who were determined to maintain, at all hazards, the pretensions of the hierarchical system, and to employ for this purpose the strongest and most violent measures; the other, who were inclined to more moderate proceedings. The former, at whose head stood the deceased pope himself, were for uniting themselves with the enemies of the emperor in Italy and Sicily, and pronouncing the ban upon him; the other, to which those cardinals belonged who already under the preceding reign had pushed forward the negotiations with the emperor, wished for a peaceable termination of the difficulties. The first party chose as pope the cardinal Roland, of Siena, and he assumed the name of Alexander the Third; the second party chose the cardinal Octavian, who gave himself the name of Victor the Fourth. The emperor could not doubt for a moment which of these two parties was the most favourably disposed to his own interest; as the popes themselves plainly expressed their different principles by the different tone in which they addressed him. But he was very far from being disposed to intermeddle with the inner affairs of the church; he only meant to take advantage of this strife so as to be able, after the example of the Othos and of Henry the Third, to hit upon the legitimate measures for the removal of the present schism, and the establishment of a universally recognized pope. He announced a church assembly to meet in the year 1160 at



Pavia, before which the two competitors should appear, in order that their respective claims to the papal dignity might then be scrutinized. But Alexander, without regard to any further scrutiny, considered himself as the only regular pope, and declared it to be an unheard-of pretension, that a layman should presume to set himself up as judge over such an affair. He looked upon the council at Pavia as an altogether disorderly assembly. Victor, on the other hand, recognized this tribunal. When the council had assembled, the emperor declared he had now done all that belonged to *his* vocation; nothing else remained for him than to await the decision of God, through those whom he had appointed the judges in this matter; whereupon he withdrew from the transactions. The council recognized Victor as the regular pope, and Frederic sought to promote his authority by every means of power and influence within his command. But although Alexander was compelled to yield to the authority of the emperor, and in the year 1162 to seek a refuge in France, yet he continually gained more and more on his side the public opinion in the church; the heads of the clerical and of the monastic orders stood up for him or demanded a true general council, as alone competent to decide this controversy.\* All who were devoted to the church theocratical system saw in Alexander the champion of a holy cause, and in Victor a tool of the imperial power.† Alexander too, like

\* So the provost Gerhoh, who calls the assembly at Pavia only a "curia Papiensis," in Ps. cxxxiii. f. 1042.

† So Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, or John of Salisbury, in his name (ep. 48, in the letter of J. of Salisbury), in a letter to king Henry the Second, of England, whom the emperor was seeking to gain over to Victor: Absit, ut in tanto periculo ecclesiæ pro amore et honore hominis faciatis, nisi quod crederetis Domino placiturum, nec deceat majestatem vestram. si placet, ut in tota ecclesia regni vestri superponatis hominem, qui sine electione, ut publice dicitur, sine gratia Domini per favorem unius imperatoris tantum honorem ausus est occupare. Nam tota fere ecclesia Romana in parte Alexandri est. Incredibile autem est, quod pars illa possit obtinere, prævalere per hominem, cui justitia deest, cui Dominus adversatur. He then cites the example of the popes, since the time of Urban the Second, who began in weakness, and, after having been acknowledged in France, triumphed over their opponents. John of Salisbury declares, very strongly, his opposition to the council of Pavia: Universalem ecclesiam quis particularis ecclesiæ subjecit judicio? Quis Teutonicos constituit judices nationum? Quis

his predecessors, was greatly indebted to the influence of the monks.\*

Still less authority than Victor's was enjoyed by his successors nominated by the imperial party, Paschalis the Third (1164), and Calixtus the Third (1168). The tyranny which the emperor exercised in Italy, the struggle of the Longobard states for their freedom, procured allies for the pope with whom he could constantly fortify himself more strongly against the emperor; and after the unfortunate campaign in Italy, in 1176, Frederic was induced to conclude at Venice a peace with the pope, upon conditions prescribed by the latter. This victory was interpreted by the adherents of the church theocratical system as a judgment of God in favour of the papacy.† The seal was set to this victory by the Lateran council, which Alexander, as universally acknowledged pope, held in the year 1179, and by which an ordinance was passed in relation to papal elections, in order to prevent similar schisms to those that had recently occurred. It was thereby determined,‡ that the individual chosen by the votes of two-thirds of the cardinals should be lawful pope; and in case the person chosen by the minority, consisting of the other third, should set himself up as pope in opposition, he and his adherents should be liable to excommunication.

*hanc brutis, impetuosius hominibus auctoritatem contulit, ut pro arbitrio principem statuunt super capita filiorum hominum?*

\* In the life of bishop Anthelm, by Bellay, in the *Actis Sanctor.* Jun. T. V. c. iii. f. 232, it is stated that quum universa pæne anceps ecclesia vacillaret, the Carthusian order, at first, used their influence in favour of Alexander: *Præcedentibus itaque Cartusiensibus et Cisterciensibus Alexander papa ecclesiarum in partibus Galliæ, Britanniæ, atque Hispaniæ, cito meruit obedientiam habere.*

† Thus wrote John of Salisbury, who from this result entertained the hope that the contest for the interest of the church in England would have a like issue (ep. 254): *Nam quæ capiti schismatis confurebant membra cointereunt eoque succiso corpus totum necesse est interire. Vidimus, vidimus hominem, qui consueverat esse sicuti leo in domo sua, domesticos evertens et opprimens subjectos sibi, latebras querere et tanto terrore concuti, ut vix tutus esset in angulis abditis suis. Illum, illum imperatorem, qui totius orbis terror fuerat, utinam vidissetis ab Italia fugientem cum ignominia sempiterna, ut his cautulam procuraret aut ruinam, qui catholicorum laboribus insultabant ex successibus et furore ejus. Ergo conceptam laudem Dei silere quis poterit? Ipse enim est, qui facit mirabilia magna solus.*

‡ Can. I.

Still stronger did the power of the papacy exhibit itself in another contest, between the secular power and the church, which arose in another quarter, namely England. Thomas Becket had come as archdeacon to the court of king Henry the Second of England, and, getting more and more into the confidence of that monarch, was finally appointed chancellor, in which post his word became law. Without doubt, the king supposed that he should most certainly promote his own interest if, availing himself of the vacancy of the archbishopric of Canterbury, in the year 1162, he proceeded to make his favourite, the man hitherto so devoted to him, primate of the English church, while at the same time he allowed him to continue in the same relations to himself, as his chancellor. But he found himself altogether deceived in his expectations; for Thomas Becket from that moment changed entirely the whole mode of his life,\* and with still greater zeal served the interest of the hierarchy than he had before served the interests of the king. It was to him an affair of conscience, not to surrender a tittle of anything pertaining to the cause of the church, and to the dignity of the priesthood, contemplated from the hierarchical point of view which was common at that time.† When he resigned his post as chancellor, king Henry regarded it as an indication of his change of views on political and ecclesiastical interests, and was by this circumstance first prejudiced against him; and his previous inclina-

\* Still, owing to his ascetic zeal, he could not be induced to make any such alterations in his diet as were too much at variance with his previous habits: and when once at the common table of the clergy, a pheasant was placed before him, said he to one of his companions at the table, who took offence at it: "Truly, my brother, if I do not mistake, thou eatest thy beans with more relish than I do the pheasant set before me." See his life by Heribert of Boseham (ed. sup.), with the letters of Thomas, in the collection of the four lives, p. 25.

† The bishop's zealous friend, John of Salisbury, expresses himself somewhat dissatisfied with his rough and stern proceedings at the outset: *Novit cordium inspector, et verborum iudex et operum, quod sæpius et asperius, quam aliquis mortalium corripuerim archiepiscopum de his, in quibus ab initio dominum regem et suos zelo quodam inconsultius visus est ad amaritudinem provocasse, cum pro loco et tempore et personis multa fuerint dispensanda.* By his opponents he was accused of covetousness and nepotism, in procuring preferments for his relatives. The latter certainly not without good grounds, as may be gathered from the way in which his zealous friend Peter de Blois defends him (in ep. 38).

tion in his favour must have gone on continually changing into greater aversion, when he saw in the man whom he had hoped to find a grateful and zealous servant, his most resolute adversary. One fact, which proves what an injury great external privileges were to the true interests of the spiritual order is this; there were to be found among the clergy of England men who, by the commission of the worst crimes, had fallen under the jurisdiction of the civil tribunals. The king demanded that such persons, after having been divested in the usual form of their spiritual character, should be given over to the common tribunal, and suffer the punishment appointed by the laws. He alleged, in support of this, that the loss of the clerical dignity was to such people no punishment at all; that the more they dishonoured by their crimes the clerical profession, the severer ought to be their punishment. By being suffered to go unpunished, such crimes spread with fearful rapidity.\* Yet the archbishop, carried away by his hierarchical delusion, thought himself bound to insist that, even in these unworthy subjects, the clerical character and the jurisdiction of the church should be respected. In the year 1164 the king caused sixteen resolutions to be laid before an assembly composed of spiritual and lay orders, at Clarendon, which related to the securing of the civil power against the encroachments of the hierarchy. They were adopted, under oath, by all; and even Thomas Becket yielded to the prevailing spirit. But soon his hierarchical conscience loaded him with the severest reproaches; he put on the dress of a penitent; he proposed to resign his bishopric, of which he had showed himself so unworthy; to withdraw into solitude and do penance, both on account of the transgressions of his earlier life at court, and on account of this last infidelity to the interests of the church. He drew up a report to the pope of what had transpired, and left the whole to be disposed of by his decision. The pope confirmed him in his resistance to those sixteen

\* Which the king says: *Per hujusmodi castigationes talium clericorum imo verius coronatorum demonum flagitia non reprimi, sed potius in dies regnum deterius fieri. Ad nocendum fore promptiores, nisi post pœnam spiritualem corporali pœnæ subdantur. Et pœnam parum curare de ordinis amissione, qui ordinis contemplatione a tam enormibus manus continere non verentur et tanto deteriores esse in scelere, quanto sunt cæteris ordinis privilegio digniores.* Heribert. p. 33.

articles, and absolved him from his obligation of his unlawfully given oath; but encouraged him to continue the administration of the archbishopric for the good of the church. This was the signal for a fierce and wearisome contest between the archbishop and the king. Becket sought refuge in France, where he spent nearly seven years in exile. From both sides, delegates were sent to the pope; Becket visited him in person. But the affair lingered along, since the king and his money had their influence also at the papal court; \* since, on the one hand, there was an unwillingness to make a victim of the bishop, who stood up so firmly and staked his all for the interest of the hierarchy: but on the other hand, too, there was great reason to fear lest, in the contest then going on with the emperor Frederic, the latter, and his pope, should procure an important ally in the king of England, if he should be driven to an extreme. At length, however, a treaty of peace seemed to have been brought about; and Becket, in 1170, returned back to England. But the reconciliation was but transitory; and as the archbishop pursued the same principles with inflexible consistency, the quarrel could not fail to break out anew. Becket was received by one party with enthusiastic admiration, by the other with abhorrence; since they looked upon him as nothing better than a traitor to his king and country. Four knights considered some remark which escaped the king in a moment of violent anger, as an invitation to revenge him on the archbishop, and the latter was murdered by them in the church. Yet, under these circumstances, his death could not but serve directly to procure the most brilliant victory for the cause for which he contended. He appeared to the people as a martyr for the cause of God; as a saint; crowds flocked to pray before his tomb; and soon divers stories got abroad about the wonderful cures performed there. Men of all ranks bore testimony to their truth. John of Salisbury, a man of spirit and intelligence, but we must add, too, the archbishop's enthusiastic friend as well as fellow-sufferer, having served him in the capacity of archdeacon and

\* *Metuebat (Romanus pontifex), quod si ita omnino rex pateretur repulsam, majus in ecclesia schisma faceret, quod et ipsi, qui missi fuerant et præsertim laici minabantur.* In favour of the king was a majority of the cardinals, quibus ut principibus et magnatibus placeant, studere mos est, aliis vero renitentibus. Heribert. p. 75

secretary, even he speaks of them with astonishment as an eye-witness; so that striking appearances, produced either by the ecstatic flights of a strong faith or by an excited fancy, must certainly have occurred there.\* It was in vain that Becket's opponents sought to suppress this enthusiasm by outward force; it only burst forth with the more violence.† In these facts, men saw a testimony from God mightier than the decisions of the pope. Instead of Becket's needing any testimony from the pope, thought his party, these miracles wrought at his tomb were much rather a testimony for the cause of pope Alexander himself against his adversaries; for Becket had in truth been a zealous adherent of the latter. He must have been a schismatic, if it were not right to consider this person the lawful pope; and a schismatic, God would not honour by miracles.‡ King Henry was deeply affected when he heard of Becket's death. He did penance, because his words, though without intention on his part, had given occasion for such a deed. He made every effort to justify himself before the pope and procure his absolution. He acquiesced in all the conditions prescribed, and yielded more than Thomas Becket had

\* *Multa et magna miracula fiunt, catervatim confluentibus prælatis, ut videant in aliis et sentiant in se potentiam et clementiam ejus, qui semper in sanctis suis mirabilis et gloriosus est. Nam et in loco passionis ejus et ubi ante majus altare pernoctavit humandus et ubi tandem sepultus est, paralytici curantur, cæci vident, surdi audiunt, loquuntur muti, claudi ambulant, evadunt febricitantes, arrepti a dæmonio liberantur et a variis morbis sanantur ægroti, blasphemi a dæmonio arrepti confunduntur.—Quæ profecto nulla ratione scribere præsumsissem, nisi me super his fides oculata certissimum reddidisset. Ep. 286.*

† John of Salisbury says: *Inhibuerunt nomine publicæ potestatis, ne miracula, quæ fiebant, quisquam publicare præsumeret. Carterum frustra quis obnubilare desiderat, quod Deus clarificare disponit. Eo enim amplius pererebuere miracula, quo videbantur impiis studiosius occultanda.*

‡ John of Salisbury, ep. 287. *Dubitatur a plurimis, an pars domini papæ, in qua stamus, de justitia niteretur, sed eam a crimine schismatis gloriosus martyr absolvit, qui si fautor esset schismatis nequaquam tantis miraculis coruscaret. He thinks he should have been very much surprised that the pope did not at once pronounce Thomas Becket a saint, unless he had remembered what was done in the Roman senate on the report of Pilate, ne deitas Christi, cujus nomen erat Judæis et gentibus prædicandum, terrenæ potestati videretur obnoxia et emendicatam dicerent infideles.—Sic ergo nutu divino arbitror evenisse, ut martyris hujus gloria nec decreto pontificis nec edicto principis attollatur, sed Christo præcipue auctore invalescat.*

ever been able to gain during his lifetime. The king himself made a pilgrimage to his tomb, and there submitted to exercises of penance.

Through the yielding of the emperor Frederic, to which he had been moved by the force of circumstances and by considerations of prudence, nothing in the relation of the two parties,—of which one defended a papal absolutism, requiring entire subjection of the states and churches; the other, the rights of independent state authority,—nothing of all this had been changed. The principles which had come under discussion in the controversies about investiture, which had been placed in a still clearer light and more widely diffused through the influence of Arnold of Brescia, and to the promotion of which the study of the Roman law, begun with so much zeal at the university of Bologna, had contributed,—these principles we find expressed in the acts and public declarations of the Hohenstaufen emperors. Gottfried of Viterbo, who was secretary and chaplain to the emperors Conrad the Third, Frederic the First, and Henry the Sixth, and had opportunities enough to hear what was said at the imperial court;—this writer, in speaking of the controversy between the imperial and the papal parties, in his *Chronicle*, or *Pantheon*,\* quotes these declarations from the lips of the former. The emperor Constantine, to whose donation to the Roman bishop Silvester, men were in the habit of appealing, had by no means conceded to the popes an authority of lordship in Italy, but chosen them, as priests of the Supreme God, for his spiritual fathers, and sought blessing and intercession at their hands. Had he actually conceded to the pope a right of sovereignty over Italy, he could not have left the Western empire, of which Italy was a part, to one of his sons; and so, too, Rome went along with the Western empire to the succeeding emperors. As he affirms, men appealed to the words of Christ: “Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and to God the things that are God’s;” to the fact that Christ paid the tribute-money for himself and for Peter; to the declaration of St. Paul concerning the respect due to those in authority; and yet, they added, this declaration had immediate reference to a Nero. We here listen to well-known voices, which we already

\* P. 16. Muratori, *Scriptores rerum Italicarum*, T. VII. f. 360.

heard speaking in the controversies which preceded, and which are again re-echoed in the letters of Frederic the Second.

Nor had the emperor Frederic the First by any means given up the plan which he had hitherto followed in the contest with the pope, but was making new preparations to prosecute it. He had been at work to establish anew his authority in Italy. He sought, by uniting the kingdom of the Sicilies with the imperial crown, to oppose a twofold power against the popes, in their own vicinity. This was accomplished by his son Henry the Sixth, who was animated by the same spirit with his father. The most difficult and unequal contest seemed to stand before the papal power; on one side, the emperor Henry the Sixth, in the vigour of manhood, and at the summit of his power; on the other, the feeble old man Celestin the Third, now past his eightieth year; but, by circumstances not entering into the calculations of human wisdom, in which oftentimes the sudden turn of important events compels us to recognize the guidance of an invisible hand, a change was suddenly brought about of an altogether opposite kind. The emperor Henry died in the year 1197: in the following year died the pope; and his successor was the cardinal Lothario, of Anagni, one of the most distinguished men who were ever invested with the papal dignity, and now not over forty years old.\* Innocent the Third united in himself the three parts which Alexander the Third had required as necessary to the right administration of the papal office: zeal in preaching, ability in church-governance, and skill in the management of penance.† He was, so far as the power of a correct judgment was possible at *his own* point of view, well acquainted with the relations and wants of the church in his time, and had been educated according to the system of theology taught in the universities of that period, for he had studied at the university of Paris, a fact of which he speaks with particular pleasure

\* Hence the remark of the German poet Walter von der Vogelweide: "O we der babst ist ze junc, hilf Herre diner Kristenheit." P. 9, in Lachmann's Ausgabe, v. 35.

† When some person had said to Alexander the Third: Domine, bonus papa es, quidquid facis papale est; he replied: Si scirem bien i (n) viare bien predicar e penitense donar, io seroie boene pape. See Petri Cantoris verbum abbreviatum, pag. 171.



and gratitude.\* He was entirely filled with the idea of the papal monarchy over the world, and contrived to make use of the conjunction of many favourable circumstances with skill and energy for the realization of that idea. His activity extended over a field of enormous extent,†—it reached to every quarter of the world. His watchful eye observed everything that transpired in churches and states. By his legates, he would make his presence everywhere felt, and enforce obedience.‡ Over bishops and monarchs, in affairs ecclesiastical and political, which latter he believed he could bring before his tribunal, in so far as they should be decided on religious or moral principles, he asserted his supreme juridical authority with energy and firmness.§ His numerous letters, the records of his active guidance of the church, certainly evince that he was animated, not solely by a zeal for the maintenance of the papal authority and dominion, but also by a zeal for the true well-being of the church; but devoted to that system of a spiritual monarchy over the world, in which secular and spiritual matters were already so confounded together, as a system founded in divine right; and feeling himself bound to defend this system as well against reactions proceeding from a

\* In a letter to the king of France: *Tibi et regno tuo specialiter nos fatemur teneri, in quo nos recolimus in studiis literarum ætatem transigisse minorem ac divino munere quantæcunque scientiæ donum adeptos, beneficiorum impensam multiplicem suscepisse.* See epp. lib. i. ep. 171.

† In a letter in which, impressed with a sense of the difficulties and the responsibility of his office, he implores an interest in the prayers of the abbots of the Cistercian chapter, he notices the many kinds of business devolving on him, yet doubtless without naming them all, as follows:—*Nunc ambigua questionum elucidans et certo in ambiguis usus responso, nunc difficiles nodos casuum justæ diffinitionis manu dissolvens, nunc malignorum incursus refrænans, nunc humilibus clypeum apostolicæ protectionis indulgens.* Lib. I. ep. 358.

‡ His words: “If the omnipresent God still makes angels his ministers, how should the pope, who is a limited man, be able to extend his activity to all countries in any other way than by legates?” *Si ergo nos, quos humana conditio simul in diversis locis corporaliter esse non patitur, hujusmodi naturæ defectum per angelos nostros redimere nequiverimus, quomodo judicium et justitiam et alia, quæ ad summi pontificis officium pertinent, in gentibus longe positis faciemus?* Lib. XVI. ep. 12.

§ Ep. lib. I. ep. 324. Decision on the right of property in a lot of land. Lib. I. ep. 249, that his legate should force the kings of Portugal and Castile, by ban and interdict, to remain faithful to the league they had sworn to each other.

good, as those proceeding from a bad spirit, he was betrayed by his bad cause into the use of bad means.

A proof of this is the history of his controversies with England. King John, with whom he there had to contend, was a man utterly destitute of moral worth, accustomed to follow all his lusts and passions without restraint, and to yield himself to every caprice. Fear alone could restrain him. Even to the religious impressions, which had so much power in his times, his inherent sensual barbarity was unsusceptible. He wavered betwixt a brutal infidelity and a servile superstition. A dispute concerning the filling up of a vacancy left by the archbishop of Canterbury, gave the pope opportunity to guide the choice after his own will, and he fixed upon an Englishman, cardinal Stephen Langton, to occupy this post. The king thought he might complain that his wishes had not been duly consulted in this affair, and perhaps too he was averse to the man, who may have been one of the worthier sort. At first he repelled with blind defiance all the representations and threats of the pope. The interdict under which England was laid in 1208 could not break down his stubborn self-will, great as was the terror which elsewhere such a measure at that time spread all around; for the entire people, innocent and guilty, must suffer, because the king would not obey the pontiff; all must be deprived of the blessing of the church. Of the sacraments, none but extreme unction, the baptism of children, and confession were permitted. The bodies of the dead were borne forth and buried without prayer or the attendance of priests.

There was one individual, however, who encouraged the king to despise the interdict which filled so many minds with uneasiness. The man who possessed this influence with the king, a theologian named Alexander, had not adopted this policy through any interest for the truth, but solely induced by the most sordid motives of gain. He courted the king's favour to promote his own advantage, acting as the tool of his despotism in the contest with papal absolutism. "This calamity," said he to the poor, miserable monarch, "had not come upon England by the king's fault, but on account of the vices of his subjects." The king himself was the scourge of the Lord, and ordained of God to rule the people with a rod of iron. As often happens, the same was said here to uphold

the interest of political despotism as had been said by others to defend the interests of truth and piety: that over the possessions of princes and potentates, and over civil governments, the pope had no jurisdiction whatever; for, to the first of the apostles, to Peter, was committed by our Lord only a purely spiritual authority. This worthless individual was overloaded by the king with benefices; but he afterwards experienced the just reward of his baseness, for the very king whom he had served afterwards gave him up to the pope; and, stripped of all his prebends, he saw himself reduced to the condition of a beggar.\*

The circumstance which at last, after a resistance of five years, bowed the stubborn will of the king to submission, was not the might of the spiritual weapons of the pope, but fear of a foreign power which the pope managed to raise up against him, under the form of a crusade. King Philip Augustus of France welcomed the opportunity which gave him a chance in executing on king John the papal sentence of deposition, of making himself master of the English crown. As the latter had the more occasion to dread such a war because he had exasperated his subjects and excited discontent amongst his nobles; so, in the year 1213, he humbled his tone from that of insolent defiance to an equally slavish submission. He acknowledged the pope as his liege lord, received the crown from his hands, swore subjection to him like a vassal, and bound himself to assist in a crusade which Innocent was then labouring with great zeal to set on foot. The pope now became his protector, and adopted him as a penitent prodigal. When the nobles of England, dissatisfied with the self-degradation of their king, and with his many arbitrary acts, sought to revive the old liberties of the realm, and to oppose a firm check to despotism, it was the pope who now turned his spiritual arms to fight the battles of such a king. But if the popes, when they appeared as defenders of justice and of sacred institutions and customs, as protectors of oppressed innocence, could not fail thereby to present the pontifical dignity in a more advantageous light to the nations, a proceeding of this sort, where it was so plainly evinced that they were ready to sacrifice everything else to their personal aggrandizement,

\* See Matthew of Paris, at the year 1209, f. 192.

could only produce an impression injurious to their reputation on the public conscience. In England, it was already murmured: "Thou, who, as holy father, as the pattern of piety and the protector of justice and truth, oughtest to let thy light shine before the whole world, dost thou enter into concord with such a wretch—praise and protect such a monster? But thou defendest the tyrant who cringes before thee, that thou mayest draw everything into the whirlpool of Roman cupidity; yet such a motive directly charges thee as guilty before God."\* The city of London despised the ban and the interdict whereby the pope sought to compel obedience to the king. The papal bull was declared null; for such things did not depend on the pope's decision, since the authority bestowed on the apostle Peter by our Lord related solely to the church. "Why does the insatiable avarice of Rome," it was said, "stretch itself out to us? What concern have the apostolical bishops with our domestic quarrels? They want to be successors of Constantine, not of Peter. If they do not follow Peter in his works, they cannot partake of his authority; for God treats men according to their true deserts. Shameful! to see these miserable usurers and promoters of simony aiming already, by means of their ban, to rule over the whole world. How very different from Peter, the men who claim to possess his authority!"† And, in despite of the interdict, public worship still continued to be kept up in London.

The present relations of the papal dominion to the German empire were also favourable to it. The young prince Frederic the Second, a child only a few years old, left behind him by the emperor Henry the Sixth, had been recommended by his

\* The free-spirited English historian, Matthew of Paris, quotes such words (f. 224)) from the lips of the English barons. It certainly appears, comparing it with other expressions of his, that he cannot seriously mean what he himself says against this: *Et sic barones lacrimantes et lamentantes regem et papam maledixerunt, imprecantes inexpressibiliter, cum scriptum sit: principi non maledices, et pietatem et reverentiam transgredientur, cum illustrem Joannem regem Angliæ servum asseruerunt, cum Deo servire regnare sit.*

† Matthew of Paris, who cites such voices, adds, to be sure, what hardly could be his honest opinion: *Sic igitur blasphemantes, ponentes os in cælum ad interdicti vel excommunicationis sententiam nullum penitus habentes respectum, per totam civitatem celebrarunt divina signa, pulsantes et vocibus altisonis modulantes.*

mother Constantia, on her deathbed, to the guardianship of the pope. Frederic, it is true, was already elected king of Rome, but there appeared to be no possibility of making his claims valid. His uncle, Philip, duke of Suabia, and the duke Otho of Saxony, were contending with one another for the imperial dignity, and this furnished the pope with another welcome opportunity of placing the papal power high above every other subsisting among men; to appropriate to himself the supreme direction of all human affairs, the right of deciding as to the disposition of the contested imperial crown. Innocent, to prepare the way for the decision of this dispute, drew up a writing,\* in which, making use of various passages of Scripture, particularly from the Old Testament, he brings together, in the usual scholastic form of that time, the arguments for and against the choice of all three,—Frederic, Philip, and Otho. Against Philip he objected, that he was descended of a race hostile to the church; that the sins of the fathers would be visited upon the children to the third and fourth generations, if they followed their father's example. In favour of Otho, it was alleged, on the other hand, that he had sprung from a race constantly devoted to the church; and the pope concluded, after examining all the arguments on both sides, that, if the German princes, when he had waited a sufficient length of time, could not unite in the choice of any one, he should give his voice for Otho. When, in pursuance of this resolution, he, in the year 1201, caused duke Otho to be recognized by his legates as king of Rome, and pronounced excommunication on all his opponents, he met with determined resistance from Philip's party, which constituted the majority. A portion of it, including several bishops, issued a letter to the pope,† in which they very strongly expressed their surprise at the conduct of his legate. "Where had it ever occurred in the case of any of his predecessors, that they so interfered in the election of an emperor as to represent themselves either as electors or as umpires over the election? Originally, no papal election could be valid without the concurrence of the emperor; but the magnanimity of the emperors had led them to renounce this right. If, now, the simplicity of laymen had given up, from a feeling of reverence to the

\* Registr. ed. Baluz. i. f. 697.

† L. c. f. 715.

church, a right previously exercised by them, how should the sacredness of the papacy presume to usurp to itself a right which it never possessed?" Innocent replied to this protestation in a letter to the duke of Zähringen: "Far was it from him," he wrote, "to take away from the princes the right of election, which belonged to them by ancient custom, especially since it was by the apostolical see itself, which had transferred this right from the Greeks to the Germans, that the same had been given them; but the princes should also understand that to the pope belonged the right of trying the person elected king, and of promoting him to the empire, since it is the pope who has to anoint, to consecrate, and to crown him. Suppose then, even by a unanimous vote of the princes, the choice should fall on an excommunicated person, on a tyrant, on a madman, or on a heretic, or heathen, — is the pope to be forced to anoint, consecrate, and crown such a person?" After the assassination of duke Philip, in the year 1208, no power remained to oppose king Otho; and he continued to maintain a good understanding with the pope till he obtained from him the imperial crown. But as he defended, against him, the rights of the empire, so he soon fell into a quarrel with him; which was finally carried to such a length, that the pope pronounced the ban upon him. And now his choice fell on the prince whom he had at first endeavoured to place at the farthest distance from the imperial throne, the young prince, Frederic the Second. It was not till the pope had examined the choice of the princes at the Lateran council, in 1215, that he ratified it.

The emperor Frederic might well adopt, from the first, the spirit which animated his ancestry in their contests with the popes; nor were the teachings of his own experience, from his earliest childhood,\* calculated to inspire him with much love for them. Still, his natural prudence forbade him, in the outset, to let his designs be known publicly. As the getting up of a new crusade was a favourite thought of Innocent's successor, Honorius the Third, which lay nearer to his heart than the interest of the papal hierarchy, so Frederic

\* Frederic complains, *L. I. ep. 20, de Vineis*, of the bad treatment he had already received from pope Innocent the Third, to whose guardianship he had been committed by his dying mother.

could take advantage of this humour of the pope, and, by falling in with it, carry out many objects of his own, which under other circumstances would not have been possible. He amused the pope, however, by putting off, from one time to another, the fulfilment of his promise to undertake a crusade. When the last term had arrived, in which Frederic had bound himself, under penalty of the ban, actually to engage in his crusade, Honorius died. This was in the year 1227. His successor, Gregory the Ninth, though now seventy-seven years old, was still full of energy, and as the papal hierarchy was with him a more important object than the cause of the crusades, the emperor found it more difficult to satisfy him. Frederic seemed disposed really to fulfil the promise given two years before. A great army assembled near Brindisi, for the purpose of passing by sea to the East. The emperor had already embarked; when compelled, as he said, by illness, he turned back, and the whole expedition was broken up. The pope looked upon this as a mere pretext; and at the Anglo-Roman Synod of Easter he pronounced the ban on the emperor, and absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance. In a letter to the king of England,\* the emperor complained of the wrong done him by the pope; he solemnly avowed his innocence, and declared it to be his determination to fulfil his vow as soon as it was possible. He sought to show, that cupidity and ambition lay at the bottom of all the machinations of the Roman court.† “The primitive church, founded in poverty and simplicity, had been fruitful of holy men; but through superabundance of earthly goods she had been corrupted.” He drew a picture of the extortions, which, to the great injury of Christendom, proceeded from Rome; he pointed to the history of England in the times of Innocent the Third, as a warning against papal ambition, which sought to make all empires dependent on itself; and he called upon the princes to take a lesson from his own example, and, according to the ancient proverb, “Look out for themselves, when their neighbour’s house was on fire.”‡

\* Matthew of Paris, at the year 1228, fol. 293.

† *Curia Romana omnium malorum radix et origo, non maternos, sed actos exercens novercales, ex cognitis fructibus suis certum faciens argumentum.*

‡ In the words of Virgil: *Tunc tua res agitur, paries quum proximus ardet.*

Still the emperor, doubtless, understood that he should always have the public voice against him till he had reffed, by his own action, the reproachful charges of the pope.\* In the year 1228 he undertook an expedition to Palestine. This, however, would in the eyes of the pope only make the matter worse ; for it appeared an unheard-of contempt of the authroity of the church, that Frederic should venture so to despise the ban pronounced on him as to put himself at the head of so holy an enterprise. He issued the command to Palestine, that no one should obey the emperor, since he was an excommunicated person. He sought to stir up enemies against him on all sides, and his states were threatened. The emperor managed to render all these attempts abortive. He hit upon the expedient of issuing his orders to the army, not in his own name, but in the name of God and of Christendom. Through favourable political circumstances, he succeeded in concluding a peace of ten years with the Sultan of Egypt ; whereby, to be sure, the wishes of those who felt a deeper interest than the emperor for the cause of Christianity in the East were by no means satisfied. At the holy sepulchre, he placed upon his head the crown of the kingdom of Jerusalem, and, in his letters written to Europe, boasted, with a tone of triumph, of the great things he had been able to accomplish in so short a time. "The finger of God," he declared, "was manifestly in it." Then, in the year 1229, he hastened back to Europe, to the relief of his hardly-pressed states. Here he found very many enemies to contend with ; and the pope endeavoured to get up a general crusade against him. The emperor easily got the victory ; yet he understood too well the spirit of his age, to be disposed to push things to an extreme. He concluded, in 1230, a treaty with the pope, which was to the latter's advantage. He promised to obey the commands of the church, on all the points with reference to which he had been excommunicated. Yet, as both remained true to their principles, this peace could not be of very long duration ; and though they were apparently

\* It was the emperor's true mode of thinking which he expressed when he declared among the Mohammedans that he had undertaken this expedition, and was obliged to acquire something by means of it, in order to restore his good fame in the West. See *Extraits des historiens Arabes relatifs aux guerres des Croisades*, par M. Reinauld, 1829, pag. 429.



united, yet in secret they worked in opposition to each other. When Frederic sought to subject the cities of Lombardy, to extend and confirm his power in Italy, but refused to accept the offered mediation of the pope, which would go against his interests, the latter became still more alienated from him. He united himself with the liberty-loving cities of Lombardy, which the emperor had exasperated by his despotic conduct; and, in the year 1239, he pronounced the ban on him anew, because he had stripped the church of many of her possessions, and because of the oppressive measures with which he had burdened her. At the same time, he threw in an accusation, which, in this age, must have made a greater impression than all the rest, that, "on account of his words and deeds, which were known through the whole world, he was strongly suspected of not thinking rightly about the Catholic faith." The emperor thereupon issued a circular letter to the Christian princes and cardinals, in which he was careful to distinguish the pope from the Roman church and the papal see. While he testified his reverence for the apostolical see, he declared Gregory only to be unworthy of his office. He could not recognize as his judge a man who, from the first, had shown himself to be his bitterest enemy. The moving spring of his actions was nothing but a selfishness, which could not forgive the emperor for being unwilling to leave in his (the pope's) hands the management of Italian affairs. He appealed to the decision of a general council. To wipe away the impression which this declaration might create, the pope now came forth more openly with the charge, which before he had but hinted at. He issued a bull, in which he portrayed the emperor in the blackest colours as an infidel. He accused him of having asserted that the whole world had been deceived by three impostors,—Moses, Jesus, and Mohammed; that men should believe nothing but that which could be made out on rational grounds, and explained from the forces of nature. It was impossible to believe that God was born of a virgin.

The question here arises, whether these complaints against the religious opinions of the emperor Frederic rest on any basis of truth. Assuredly, the testimony of the pope against him cannot be received as trustworthy. Respecting a prince, who contended so powerfully against the hierarchy, and thus became involved in contentions with the monks, who served as its in-

struments ; a prince who rose above many of the prejudices of his times, and who lived on very free terms with the Saracens, it was easy to set afloat disreputable stories of this sort. A pope so passionately prejudiced against the emperor was, doubtless, inclined to believe everything bad of him ; and as the emperor called him the protector of the heretics in Milan, so he would be glad of an opportunity to retort the accusation more severely in another form. Even the historian Matthew of Paris notices the contradictions in which men involved themselves by these charges against the emperor. Sometimes he was accused of having declared all the three founders of religion to be impostors ; sometimes of having placed Mohammed above Christ. We might conceive that Frederic was led by his contest with the hierarchy, and by the clearer discernment of his less prejudiced understanding, to detect the falsifications of original Christianity, and the corruption of the church which sprung from the mixing up of spiritual and secular things. Judging from the public imperial declarations compiled by the chancellor Peter de Vineis, it might appear, we admit, that Frederic the Second aimed at a purification of the church on this particular side ; as, in a circular letter to the princes, appealing to the testimony of his conscience, and to God, he declares : " It had ever been his purpose to bring back all the clergy, and especially the higher order, to the standard of the apostolical church, when they led an apostolical life, and imitated the humility of our Lord. For such clergymen are used to behold the visions of angels, to shine by miracles, to heal the sick, to raise the dead, and to subject princes to themselves, not by arms, but by the power of a holy life." " But the clergy at present," he then adds, " devoted to the world and to drunkenness, are lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God. In their case, religion is choked by the superfluity of riches. To deprive them of those hurtful riches, with which they are damnably burdened, is a work of charity. He would invite all the princes to co-operate with him in this work, in order that the clergy, relieved of all their superfluities, may serve God, contented with a little."\* The emperor here expresses a conviction, which we find expressed in many a reaction of the Christian spirit against the secularization of the

church, since the time of Arnold of Brescia; in the prophecies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; in the songs of the German national poets; and in the phenomena of the history of sects. But the public declarations of a monarch can hardly be taken as trustworthy sources from which to form a judgment of his religious opinions; and the rest of the emperor's conduct by no means evinces that he was governed by any such plan of impoverishing the clergy. He appears in his laws to have been a violent persecutor of the sects to the advantage of the hierarchy, although in many of them he must have observed a like religious interest directed against the secularization of the church.

As to the remarks ascribed to Frederic the Second, by which he is alleged to have placed the Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan religions on one and the same level, such remarks\* may, perhaps, have only been a current form among the people for expressing a naturalistic mode of thinking. But although expressions,—actually made by no one,—but which had become stamped as the current phrase, to denote a deistic, naturalistic mode of thinking, may have been wrongfully attributed to the emperor Frederic,—yet it may be true, after all, that, from other indications, men had reason to conclude that he was really given to such a mode of thinking. Several other remarks, said to have been uttered by him, and supposed to indicate a decided infidelity, were circulated about; as, for example, that once, on seeing the Host carried by, he observed, “How long shall this imposture go on?”† It is remarkable that, among the Mohammedans, the emperor left the impression, during his stay in the East, that he was anythign but a believing Christian.‡ It may be easily explained how,—

\* See farther on, in the history of the scholastic theology.

† See Matthew of Paris, at the year 1439, f. 408; and something more definite by the contemporary Alberic, as Leibnitz (*Access. Hist. T. II. 568*) relates. The emperor's words, as the pyx was being carried by to a sick person, were—“*Heu me! quamdiu durabit truffa ista?*”

‡ Abulfeda repeats, from the mouth of a Mohammedan scholar, Gemel-ed-din, who stood high in the estimation of Frederic's sons, an account of Frederic's inclination in favour of the followers of Islam, which descended from him to his sons; with which, to be sure, the false story is joined, that, for this reason, Frederic was excommunicated by the pope, *Tom. V. pp. 145, 146*. When the words of the Koran against Christianity were proclaimed from the minaret of Omar's mosque in Je-

by his passionate contests with the popes, from whom he had experienced, ever since his earliest childhood, in the name of religion and the church, so much evil; by his opposition to the acknowledged corruption of the church; by the incongruities between the reigning church doctrine and his clear understanding, Frederic might be impelled to reject the whole at once, destitute as he was of the religious sense which would have enabled him to separate and distinguish the original faith and the foreign elements with which it had become encumbered. The influence of the learned Mohammedans, with whom he was on terms of intimacy, might also have contributed to promote such a tendency in him. We cannot be surprised that Frederic's one-sided intellectual training, in which sincerity and warmth of religious feeling had no part, should have led *him* to an infidelity, which was called forth in occasional paroxysms, at least, by mere brutal rudeness, in the case of king John of England. We might indeed say, with the historian Matthew of Paris, that the religious opinions of this emperor, concerning which we can judge but from what others report, are certainly known only to the Omniscient:\* but if we compare all the accounts diffused among Christians and Mohammedans, we must still be inclined to consider him as having been, to say the least, a denier of revealed religion. The circumstance that the pope did not make any further use of these criminations, by no means makes it clear that they were all a fabrication; for naturally, it would have been found difficult, if not impossible, to establish these charges on such grounds of evidence as were required, in order to bring a process against him.

rusalem, the *cadi*, with whom the emperor resided, was greatly annoyed. He contrived to have it stopped, lest the emperor might be offended. The latter, surprised at no longer hearing the accustomed cry from the minaret, asked the *cadi* the reason of it, and the *cadi* explained the whole matter. "You have done wrong," said the emperor; "why should you, on my account, be wanting to your duty, to your law, to your religion?" See the book of Reinauld, already referred to, p. 432. An official, attached to the mosque of Omar, who conducted him about, related that the emperor's conversation showed sufficiently that he believed nothing about Christianity; when he spoke of it, it was only to ridicule it. L. c. p. 431.

\* Matthew of Paris says, concerning Frederic's accusers on the point of his orthodoxy: *Si peccabant, vel non, novit ipse, qui nihil ignorat.* L. c. f. 527.

A conflict arose between Gregory the Ninth and the emperor Frederic, for life or for death; the old Gregory brought secular and spiritual weapons to bear against the emperor; he allied himself with the cities of Lombardy, which were battling for their freedom, and from all quarters sought to collect money to defray the expenses of the war, whence various complaints about the corruption of the Roman court, and many a free speech in opposition to it, would naturally be provoked.\* The emperor cleared himself publicly from the aspersions thrown upon him by the pope, by a full profession of orthodoxy; he contrived to prevent the introduction into his states of papal bulls, which were averse to his interests; and carried his point, in forbidding the pope's interdict to be observed. Even at Pisa, mass was celebrated in his presence. The monks and clergy who consented to be used as the pope's instruments, and refused to hold public worship, were removed from his states. His weapons also were successful. In the year 1239, his troops stood victorious before the gates of Rome. The pope meanwhile sent letters missive for a general council, to meet in 1241, and proposed to the emperor a suspension of arms, in order that the meeting might be held. Frederic, it is true, was inclined to peace; but he well understood the hostile intentions of the pope, who only wanted to use the council as an instrument against him; and he would not be hindered by it in prosecuting his designs against the Lombardian states. He therefore accepted the proposal of a cessation of hostilities, but on the condition that the Lombardian states, the allies of the pope, should have no share in it, and that no council should be assembled. The pope would not listen to this, nor yet would he suffer himself to be prevented from holding a council. He contrived so to arrange it, that a Genoese fleet should be at hand for the protection of the prelates who might attend the council. In vain were all the warnings given out by the emperor. The Genoese fleet, however, was beaten by that of the emperor, and many prelates fell into his hands as prisoners. Yet the pope, ad-

\* Matthew of Paris says: Adeo invaluit Romanæ ecclesiæ insatiabilis cupiditas. confundens fas nefasque, quod deposito rubore velut meretrix vulgaris et effrons omnibus venalis et exposita, usuram pro parvo, simoniam pro nullo inconvenienti reputavit. L. c. f. 493.

vanced as he was in years, did not suffer himself to be moved by this untoward event. He required of the emperor, to the last, unqualified submission. Frederic now saw his predictions verified, and he took no pains to conceal his joy at having penetrated into the pope's designs. He also shut his eyes to all forbearance towards the pope. In his proclamations he dwelt on the contrast between such a pope and the apostle Peter, of whom he pretended to be the vicegerent. "When the pope is in drink," said he, "he fancies himself able to control the emperor and all the kingdoms of the world."\* The aged pope died, while thus hardly pressed, in the year 1241.

After the sudden demise of Celestin the Fourth, who was chosen next, followed a two years' vacancy of the papal chair; and the cardinals, by the tardiness of the election, which many ascribed to their worldly views, to the ambition and the thirst for power of individuals, drew upon themselves violent reproaches.† Compelled by the emperor to hasten the election, they finally made choice of cardinal Sinibald of Anagni, Innocent the Fourth. The new government opened with peaceful prospects; for a treaty was set on foot between the emperor and the pope, and such an one as would redound to the advantage of the latter; but when the two principal parties came to meet for the purpose of ratifying it, they showed a mutual distrust in each other's proceedings, and the affair was spun out in length. Meantime Innocent, who had no intention to deal honestly with the emperor, escaped by flight from a situation in which, besieged by the weapons of Frederic, he could not act freely. According to a preconcerted plan, he was conveyed by a Genoese fleet to Lyons. There

\* Ep. 1. Tu ad hoc vivis ut concedas, in ejus vasis et scyphis aureis scriptum est: bibo, bibis. Cujus verbi præteritum sic frequenter in mensa repetis et post cibum, quod quasi raptus usque ad tertium cælum, Hebraice et Græce loqueris et Latine.

† So the emperor writes to them (ep. 14): Sedentes ut colubri non quæ sursum sunt, sapitis; sed quæ ante oculos sita sunt, mundana, non spiritualia intuentibus providetis. Sitit enim quælibet præsulatum et papalem esurit apicem. And in a letter of the king of France (ep. 35): Ecce nobilis urbs Romana sine capite vivit, quæ caput est aliarum. Quare? Certe propter discordiam Romanorum; sed quid eos ad discordiam provocavit? Auri cupiditas et ambitio dignitatum. He reproaches them on account of their fear of the emperor.

he placed the emperor once more under the ban. Next, he sent letters missive for a general council to meet at Lyons in the year 1245, where, also, Frederic was cited to appear and defend himself.\* The pope presented before this council many and violent charges against the emperor; and among these were charges of heresy and of suspicious connections with the Saracens. The imperial statesman, Thaddeus de Suessa, who attended the council as Frederic's envoy, the only individual who stood forth in his defence, replied to these charges with a satirical allusion to the Roman court. One thing, at least, spoke in the emperor's favour, said he; in *his* states he tolerated no usurer.† He at the same time declared, however, that to the most serious charge, that of heresy, the emperor himself alone must answer in person; and he therefore solicited a longer delay for him. With difficulty the pope was prevailed upon to grant a respite of two weeks. But Frederic declined appearing before a council got up by a pope in open hostility to him, as a thing beneath his own dignity and that of the empire. The pope now proceeded in the most solemn manner to pronounce the ban and the sentence of deposition on the emperor. Thaddeus himself was struck with awe and dismay; on the emperor alone it failed of making the least impression. On hearing of what had been done, he sent for the imperial crown, and, placing it on his head, said: "I still possess this crown; and without a bloody struggle I shall not let it be plucked away from me by the attack of any pope or council." He drew up a circular letter, addressed to all the princes, in which he expressed himself in much too strong

\* A remarkable sign of the freer public sentiment, on which already the word of popes, so manifestly governed by worldly passions and worldly interests, no longer had its former power, is the anecdote told by Matthew of Paris: A priest in Paris was obliged, in conformity with a command addressed to all, to publish the ban which had been pronounced against Frederic. In doing this, he declared that he had received it in charge to announce the ban with tapers burning and the ringing of the bells. He knew of the violent contention, and the inextinguishable hatred between them both; but as to the cause of it he knew nothing. He was aware, too, that one of the two was to blame and wronged the other; but which one it was, he did not know. But he pronounced the ban on that one, whichever it was, who wronged the other, and he pronounced those free who suffered the wrong which was so injurious to entire Christendom. See Matth. of Paris, f. 575.

† Matthew of Paris, f. 585.

and free a manner \* for the spirit of the times, against the proceedings of the pope.† “Would that we had learned a lesson,” said he, “from the example of the monarchs before us, instead of finding ourselves compelled to serve, by what we must suffer, as examples for those who come after us! The sons of our own subjects forget the condition of their fathers, and honour neither king nor emperor the moment they are consecrated as apostolical fathers. What have not all the princes to fear from this prince of the priests, if one of them takes such liberties with the emperor! The princes have none to blame but themselves; they have brought the mischief on their own heads by their submissive obedience to these pretended saints, whose ambition is large enough to swallow up the whole world.” “O, if your simple credulity would only beware of this leaven of the scribes and pharisees, which, according to the words of our Saviour, is hypocrisy, how many scandals of that Roman court you would learn to execrate, which are so infamous that decency forbids us to name them.”‡ The numberless sources of revenue by which they would enrich themselves at the expense of many an impoverished state, made them crazy, as the princes themselves must be well aware. He called upon them to unite with him in wresting from the clergy this abundance of earthly goods, which was only a source of corruption to them and to the church.

The fierce contest began anew; and in vain did the emperor at length, moved by an unfortunate turn of civil affairs, offer his hand for peace. Innocent continued implacably to carry on the war till the death of the emperor, in 1250; and the popes never ceased to persecute the descendants of the house of Hohenstaufen. Thus the papal power came forth victorious,

\* Matthew of Paris says, concerning the impression which this letter made: *Fridericus libertatem ac nobilitatem ecclesiæ, quam ipse nunquam auxit, sed magnifici antecessores ejus malo grato suo stabilierunt, toto conamine studuit annullare et de hæresi per id ipsum se reddens suspectum, merito omnem, quem hactenus in omni populo igniculum famæ propriæ prudentiæ et sapientiæ habuit, impudenter et imprudenter exstinxit atque delevit.*

† Ep. 2.

‡ O si vestræ credulitatis simplicitas a scribarum et pharisæorum fermento, quod est hypocrisis, juxta sententiam salvatoris sibi curaret attendere, quot illius curiæ turpitudines execrari possetis, quas honestas et pudor prohibet nos effari.



as to outward success, from these last violent contests; but this very victory was destined to prove its ruin. The power which could not be overthrown by outward force, must, as Bernard had foretold, prepare the way for its own destruction, by being abused. This very age furnished an example to show how a man, with no other weapons than those of piety and truth, might venture with impunity to resist the abuse of *that* power which could humble mighty monarchs.

This man was Robert Grosshead (Capito), bishop of Lincoln; a man who held also an important place among the learned theologians of his age. He was induced, by reason of a dispute with the worldly-minded canonicals of his cathedral, to make a journey to the Roman court, and thus he had an opportunity of learning, by personal observation, the whole extent of the corruption which prevailed at, and proceeded from, that court. In the year 1250 he delivered before the papal court at Lyons a strikingly bold discourse, in which he portrayed at large the faults of the church, and pointed out how far they were chargeable to the Roman court.\* “The bad shepherds,” he says, “are the cause of the infidelity, schisms, false doctrines, and bad conduct throughout the whole world.† As the great work of Christ, for which he came into the world, was the salvation of souls, and the great work of Satan is their destruction; so the shepherds, who as shepherds take the place of Jesus Christ, if they preach not the word of God,—even though they should not lead vicious lives,—are anti-Christ, and Satan, clothing himself as an angel of light.” He then goes on to describe the additional evil of a bad life in the clergy. “And the guilt of the whole,” says he, “lies at the door of the Roman court, not simply because it does not root out this evil,—when it alone is both able and bound to do so,—but still more, because itself, by its dispensations, provisions, and collation, appoints such shepherds; and thus, in order to provide for the temporal life of an individual, expose to eternal death thousands of souls, for the salvation of every one of whom Christ died. To be sure, the pope, being the vice-

\* This discourse, with other writings of Robert, is to be found in the Appendix to the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum fugiendarumque*, by Ortwinus Gratius, ed. Brown, in the App. fol. 251.

† *Mali pastores causa infidelitatis, schismatis, hæreticæ pravitatis et vitiosæ conversationis per orbem universum.*

gerent of Christ, must be obeyed. But when a pope allows himself to be moved by motives of consanguinity, or any other secular interest, to do anything contrary to the precepts and will of Christ, then he who obeys him manifestly separates himself from Christ and his body, the church, and from him who fills the apostolical chair, as the representative of Christ. *But whenever a universal obedience is paid him in such things, then comes the true and complete apostasy—the time of anti-Christ.*" He unconsciously predicts the Reformation, when he says, "*God forbid that this chair should at some future day, when true Christians refuse to obey it in such things, attempt to compel obedience, and thus become the cause of apostasy, and open schism.*"\* In opposition to the pope's practice of carrying on war with worldly weapons, he says: "Those who are anxious for the safety of this chair are much afraid that the threatening words of our Lord will be fulfilled on it, 'He who takes the sword, shall perish with the sword.'"

This bishop, after his return to England, committed the whole charge of managing the external affairs of his office to the hands of another person, reserving to himself the purely spiritual duties, which he could thus discharge to much greater advantage. He entered heartily into the business of visiting the different parts of his diocese, and laid himself out especially to preach the gospel everywhere. Preaching, he looked upon, in general, as one of the most important parts of his pastoral office, and took every pains to stir up the zeal of his clergy in it. No consideration would prevail upon him to induct clergymen whom he did not think qualified for the performance of this duty. An attempt was made from Rome, to compel this excellent man to confer a benefice within his foundation on a mere boy,—one of those papal favourites, who, besides being destitute of every spiritual qualification, could speak nothing but Italian. But he was steadfast in refusing to obey a *mandatum apostolicum* of this sort, declaring, "he was ready to pay filial obedience to the apostolical mandates, as also, he contended against everything which was at variance with the apostolical mandates; to both he was obligated by the divine

\* Absit et quod existentibus aliquibus aliquando veraciter Christo cognitis non volentibus quocunque modo voluntati ejus contraire hæc sedes et in ea præsidentes præcipiendo talibus Christi voluntate oppositum causa sint discessionis aut schismatis apparentis.

law, for an apostolical mandate was only one which agreed with the doctrine of the apostles and of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose place was especially filled by the pope in the church; for Christ himself says, 'whosoever is not with me is against me.' But the above document stood in no sort of conformity with the holiness of the apostolical chair; for by such papal ordinances, which, by the phrase '*non obstante*,' superseded all existing rules, the most shameless effrontery in lying and deceiving was encouraged, to the great injury of the Christian life and of social order, and all mutual confidence destroyed. Then again, after the sin of Satan and of anti-Christ, there was none more abominable than that of plunging souls to destruction by an unfaithful discharge of the pastoral office. The apostolical chair, on which was conferred by our Lord all power for building up, and not for pulling down, neither ought, therefore, nor could possibly ordain any thing, which would lead to such a sin; and no man, who was truly obedient to that sacred chair, and had not cut himself off from the body of Jesus Christ, could obey such commands; but, even though they should proceed from the highest class of angels, must resist them with all his might." He repeated it at the close of his letter: "The fullness of power means solely the power of doing everything for the edification of the church; by no means that which tends to her destruction. Those papal provisions tended not to edification, but most evidently to destruction. The apostolical chair could not therefore approve of such provisions; for flesh and blood, which cannot be partakers of the kingdom of God, have revealed this; not the Father of Jesus Christ which is in heaven."\* Amidst positions and maxims of church doctrine, the principle forces its way through, in this witness of the truth, that faith clings only to Christ, and must examine and prove everything by its relation to him, to his spirit and laws. Zealous as this bishop was in defence of the papal authority, he himself maintaining in the contest with the king of England that the pope must be supported with money during his exile in France, still, his whole mode of action proceeds from the principle, as its starting-point, that men are bound to obey the pope only so far as they actually recognize in him the organ of Christ; so far as his commands harmonize with Christ's doctrines.

\* See Matthew of Paris, f. 570.

The pope, who was accustomed to triumph over the mightiest princes, was greatly exasperated at this boldness of an English bishop, and would have gladly made him feel at once the absoluteness of his papal power. But some cardinals kept him back : for their bad consciences made them dread the force of the public discontent, provoked by so many abuses proceeding from and promoted by the Roman court, and the voice of truth, supported by the personal authority of the worthy bishop. They held that it would be better to keep still, and so prevent the sensation which the affair might create.\*

A legend recorded by Matthew of Paris, in his historical work, deserves to be noticed as characteristic of the times, and showing the influence which the corruption of the Roman court had on the public judgment. The pope is said to have intended to avenge himself on the pious and free-spirited bishop after his death, which shortly occurred, by causing his bones to be disinterred ; but one night the bishop appeared to him, and, fixing on him a stern and threatening look, struck him upon the side with his crosier. This made so profound an impression on the pope that, from that day onward, pursued by one divine judgment after another, he had not a moment's repose.† So in the descriptions generally, which the English historian, Matthew of Paris, gives of the later popes of this century, and in the legends recorded by him of their reappearance after death, we see what an unfavourable influence the abuse of the papal power must have had on the tone of public feeling ; and the indignation of the German people against the popes already expressed itself strongly in the songs and ballads of the thirteenth century.‡

When pope Alexander the Fourth commenced his administration with requesting that all Christians would pray for him,

\* Deserving of notice is the presentiment of a fall of the Romish church, to be brought about by this corruption proceeding from Rome, which expresses itself in the way in which Matthew of Paris accounts for the concern expressed by many cardinals: *Maxime propter hoc, quia scitur, quod quandoque discessio est ventura.*

† Matthew of Paris, f. 760 : *Et qui vivum noluerat audire corripientem, senserat mortuum impingentem. Nec unquam postea ipse papa unum bonum diem vel prosperum continuavit usque ad noctem vel noctem usque ad diem, sed insomnem vel molestam.*

‡ See passages of this sort collected in Stäudlin's *Archiv für alte und neu Kirchengeschichte*, IV. 3tes St. s. 549.

it was hoped that this pontiff would distinguish himself advantageously from his predecessors ; but his subsequent conduct, the course he pursued in exacting contributions from the churches, contradicted these hopes, and his earlier professions appeared to be mere hypocrisy, and a mask to cover a worldly spirit.\*

The factions among the worldly-minded cardinals made it possible to keep the papal chair vacant during a space of three years from the year 1269. At length, in 1271, they agreed in the choice of an ecclesiastic from Liege, then absent at Ptolemais on a crusade under prince Edward of England. He took the name of Gregory the Tenth.

This pope had already bound himself to the cause of the crusades, while in the East. He therefore felt called upon to make the preparation of another a special object of attention ; and this was one of the objects for which he called together the general council at Lyons, in the year 1274, the most important transaction of his administration. But, in this century, the public sentiment had already undergone a great change on the subject of crusades ; after so many unsuccessful efforts, the zeal once so easily enlisted in these undertakings had abated. The popes of this century, when they raised their voice and fired the people to embark in such wars, could no longer rely on the *universal confidence*, which met their predecessors half-way in the twelfth century. The exactions which they were in the habit of making, under pretext of the crusades, had greatly injured these in the public opinion.† The repeated failures of the crusades led many to doubt the goodness of the cause ; and the faith of those who were ac-

\* Matthew of Paris, f. 795 : Hypocrisin reputant et sæcularitatis palliationem quamplurimi. Spes præconcepta de sanctitate papæ prorsus evanuit exsufflata. In excuse of the pope he says afterwards, that many things were done in his name, and by deceiving him, of which he was entirely innocent : Veruntamen multorum auribus veraciter instillatum est, quod de bulla decepto papa fraus committitur multiformis ; but he adds immediately, that the pope could not be excused on this ground : Sed hæc ratio, si tamen ratio est, papam non excusat.

† Matthew of Paris says expressly, that the exactions of Gregory the Ninth did permanent injury to the cause of the crusades in England. Quod fidelium circa negotium crucis tepuit, imo potius caritas refriguit generalis. Unde negotium terræ sanctæ nunquam felix super hoc suscepit incrementum. At the year 1234, f. 340.

customed to make up their judgments according to the dictates of a sensuous religion, received a violent shock from the unfortunate issue of the cause which they had regarded as a divine one, from the victory of Mohammedan arms over the banner of the cross.\* Others, who had attained to a higher position of Christian faith and knowledge, were either led by the issue of the crusades, or else availed themselves of it, to express the conviction openly, that men must attack unbelievers with other weapons than these, and employ the forces of Christendom for other objects than these.

As early as the close of the twelfth century, the abbot Joachim, of Calabria, a man earnestly desirous for a better state of the church, had spoken with remarkable freedom against the zeal for the crusades. "How many are there at the present time," said he,† "soliciting the pope that he would cause the badge of the cross to be marked on the shoulders of Christians, and really intending, under the pretext of going to the rescue of a desolate and rejected Jerusalem, to draw gain and temporal advantage to themselves out of piety. They consider not how bad it is for men to oppose the divine counsels; as when the restoration of the walls of Jericho was forbidden with a curse—1 Kings xvi. 34; Joshua vi. 26." He represents, therefore, the restoration of Jerusalem as a project opposed to the declarations of Christ concerning the destruction of that city. He then adds: "Let the popes see to it, and mourn over *their own* Jerusalem, that is, the universal church, not built by the hands of men, which God has redeemed with his own blood; and not over the fallen Jerusalem. But if the nations fight for the glorious sepulchre of our Lord, let them understand that it is not this which the Lord will raise to heaven, but rather the holy souls in whom the Lord, daily buried, by the mystery of piety, reposes and dwells, till he shall exalt them to the kingdom of his everlasting glory."‡

\* Matthew of Paris remarks, at the year 1250, f. 672: *Cœperunt multi, quos firma fides non roboraverat, desperatione contabescere. Et fides heu! heu! multorum cœpit vacillare, dicentium ad invicem: Ut quid dereliquit nos Christus, pro quo et cui hactenus militavimus?*

† Commentar. in Jeremiam, p. 284.

‡ Videant summi pontifices et doleant de sua Hierusalem, id est, ecclesia generali non manu facta, quam Deus redemit sanguine suo, et non de illa, quæ cecidit desistantque ulterius illius muros erigere, quæ quotidie morte fidelium ruit. Ac si pro sepulcro glorioso de gentibus conten-

And, in another place, he complains of the popes that, by their means, the nations and resources of Christendom are exhausted among barbarous tribes, whither they are sent under the specious pretexts of salvation and the cross.\*

The objections urged against the crusades by a party who were opposed to them at the time of the council of Lyons, are known from the manner in which Humbert de Romanis, general of the Dominican order, whom the pope had commissioned to draw up a schedule of the matters to be handled at that council, sought to refute them.† They were such as follows: That it was contrary to the examples of Christ and the apostles, to uphold religion with the sword, and to shed the blood of unbelievers. It was tempting God; because the Saracens were in all respects, in numbers, in knowledge of the country, in being accustomed to the climate, in means of subsistence, superior to the Christians. Though Christians might be allowed to fight in self-defence, yet it did not follow from this that they might attack the infidels in their own countries. It was no more right to persecute those Saracens, than it was to persecute the Jews, the idolaters, the subjugated Saracens in Europe. These wars brought neither spiritual nor temporal advantage. The Saracens were provoked by them to blaspheme the Christian faith, instead of being converted to that faith; but all of them that fell in battle sank to perdition. Nor was any temporal advantage gained from them; for it was impossible to retain possession of the conquered territories. The unhappy reverses which had been experienced, proved that these undertakings were not in accordance with the divine will. Particularly deserving of notice is what Humbert says in refutation of the first of these reasons, “That which was

*ditur, non est ipsum dominus translaturus in cœlum; sed potius sanctas animas, in quibus dominus quotidie per pietatis mysterium sepelitur, quiescit et manet, donec eas transferat et resurgant in regno claritatis æternæ.*

\* *Romani pontifices dissipant sepem imperii, imminuendis populis christianis et viribus et mittendis ad barbaras nationes sub specie salutis et crucis.* P. 292.

† Humbertus de Romanis de his quæ tractanda videbantur in Concilio generali. The first part, which consists of 27 chapters, de negotio ecclesiæ contra Saracenos. Extracts in Mansi, T. XXVI. f. 109. More full in the first part of the *Opusculum tripartitum*, published by Brown, in the Appendix to the *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum*, f. 185, seqq.

right and proper at the time of the first planting of the church is one thing; that which is required in order to preserve the church is another. To preserve the church, to defend it against those who would utterly destroy it, the sword is required. The condition of the first Christian communities, when as yet they had no power, but could only propagate themselves by humility, is quite different from the present condition of things, when the Christian people are become mighty, and not without good reason bear the sword. In earlier times, the church was defended by the gift of miracles; at present, when miracles fail, she must have recourse to arms. What is said against the employment of weapons, has reference not to the outward act, but to the *temper*, with which they should be used."\* While, in former times, the crusades had been extolled as a means whereby the vicious who embarked in them might obtain the pardon of their sins, Humbert, on the other hand, represented it as a main cause of the want of success, that precisely this class of persons had been employed; and he proposed that a competent number of pious warriors should be constantly maintained in the East as a bulwark against the Saracens.†

We have already, on a former page,‡ described the glowing zeal of that extraordinary man, Raymund Lull, for the conversion of the infidels and the extension of the Christian church. The aim of his first efforts was to bring it about, that missions and arms should be conjoined for the accomplishment of these objects. In a work which he composed at Pisa, soon after his return in April, A.D. 1308, from North Africa,§ he recommended three things: first, that four or five monasteries should be founded, in which learned and pious monks and secular clergymen might study the language of the infidels,

\* Ad præparationem animi, non ad executionem gladii.

† Ad quod eligerentur non homicidæ aut pessimi sicut hactenus, sed homines a peccatis abstinentes, quia nescit justitia Dei patrocinari criminosis, f. 119.

‡ See ante, pp. 82-96. I could not then as yet avail myself of the great collected edition of the works of Raymund Lull, which appeared at Mayence. After the printing of this section was finished, I first had the good fortune, during a residence in Munich, of being able to study this work also, among the numerous and rare treasures of the Royal library in that city.

§ Disputatio Raymundi Christiani et Hamar Saraceni.



and thus prepare themselves for preaching the gospel in the whole world. Secondly, that out of all the orders of spiritual knights not a single one should be formed for fighting against the Saracens. But this order of knights should not embark at once, as had been done before, in distant enterprises, but should first attack the empire of the Saracens in Granada, and take possession of their treasures; next, proceed to North Africa, and, last of all, buckle on their armour for the conquest of the Holy Land. Thirdly, the tenths from all the churches should be applied to this object until the holy sepulchre should be recovered. In another work,\* he introduces two ecclesiastics disputing on the question, whether it were better that some mighty prince should be commissioned to bring about the conversion of the heathen by force, or whether men should labour for the spread of the faith by means of persuasion, and by offering up their lives, according to the example of Christ and of the martyrs. Even at this period, he declared in favour of the latter plan; and to the close of his life he felt more and more convinced that this was the only Christian mode of procedure, the only one which any Christian could expect would be crowned with a blessing. In his great work, on the Contemplation of God,† where he makes all the ranks and callings of Christendom pass in review, and seeks to point out the defects in each,‡ he remarks in the section concerning knights:§ “I see many knights going to the Holy Land, in the expectation of conquering

\* *Liber super Psalmum* “*quicumque vult.*”

† T. IX. opp. ed. Mogunt. 1722, fol.

‡ To finish which work, that he might then go to meet martyrdom, was his most ardent wish; as he remarks, c. cxxxi. f. 301: “As a hungry man makes despatch, and takes large morsels, on account of his great hunger, so thy servant feels a great desire to die, that he may glorify thee. He hurries day and night to complete this work, in order that, after it is finished, he may give up his blood and his tears to be shed for thee, in the Holy Land where thou didst pour out thy precious blood and thy compassionate tears. O Lord, my help, till this work is completed, thy servant cannot go to the land of the Saracens, to glorify thy glorious name, for I am so occupied with this work, which I undertake for thine honour, that I can think of nothing else. For this reason, I beseech thee for that grace that thou wouldst stand by me, that I may soon finish it and speedily depart to die the death of a martyr out of love to thee, if it shall please thee to count me worthy of it.”

§ Chap. cxii. f. 250.

it by force of arms ; but instead of accomplishing their object, they are in the end all swept off themselves. Therefore," says he, addressing Christ, "it is my belief that the conquest of the Holy Land should be attempted in no other way than as thou and thy apostles undertook to accomplish it,—by love, by prayer, by tears, and the offering up of our own lives. As it seems that the possession of the holy sepulchre and of the Holy Land can be better secured by the force of preaching than the force of arms, therefore let the monks march forth, as holy knights, glittering with the sign of the cross, replenished with the grace of the holy spirit, and proclaim to the infidels the truth of thy passion ; let them from love to thee exhaust the whole fountain of their eyes, and pour out all the blood of their bodies, as thou hast done from love to them ! Many are the knights and noble princes that have gone to the promised land with a view to conquer it ; but if this mode had been pleasing to thee, O Lord, they would assuredly have wrested it from the Saracens who possess it against our will. Thus is it made manifest to the pious monks that thou art daily waiting for them, expecting them to do, from love to thee, what thou hast done from love to them. And they may be certain that, if from love to thee, they expose themselves to martyrdom, thou wilt hear their prayers in respect to all that which they desire to see accomplished in this world for the promotion of thy glory." And, in another passage of this work,\* he seeks to show, first, that the schism of souls, the religious strife between Saracens and Christians, was the cause of the outward war and of the many evils therewith connected ;† that by this war Christians were hindered from preaching the truth to the Saracens, whereby they might perhaps succeed to convince them, and then, through the spiritual communion of one faith, bring them back to outward peace also. He then concludes with the following prayer : "Lord of heaven, Father of all times, when thou didst send

\* T. IX. L. III. Distinct. 29, c. cciv. f. 512.

† Quia Christiani et Saraceni pugnant intellectualiter in hoc, quod discordant et contrariantur in fide, propterea pugnant sensualiter et ratione hujus pugne multi vulnerantur et captivantur et moriuntur et destruuntur, per quam destructionem devastantur et destruuntur multi principatus et multe divitiæ et multe terræ et impediuntur multa bona, quæ fierent, si non esset talis pugna.

thy son to take upon him human nature, he and his apostles lived in outward peace with Jews, Pharisees, and other men; for never, by outward violence, did they capture or slay any of the unbelievers, or of those who persecuted them. Of this outward peace they availed themselves to bring the erring to the knowledge of the truth, and to a communion of spirit with themselves. And so, after thy example, should Christians conduct themselves towards the Saracens; but since that ardour of devotion which glowed in apostles and holy men of old no longer inspires us, love and devotion through almost the whole world have grown cold; therefore do Christians expend their efforts far more in the outward than in the spiritual conflict."

At the above-mentioned council of Lyons, Gregory again introduced a new regulation with regard to papal elections, designed to prevent such delay which had preceded his own appointment. The cardinals should at least be compelled by hunger to agree in a choice. Each having his own particular cell, should remain there without liberty of leaving it until they were prepared to proceed to the election. After three days the quantity of food and drink should be diminished; and if at the expiration of eight days they had not yet agreed in their choice of a pope, they should be allowed nothing but bread, wine, and water. This ordinance, after great resistance on the part of the cardinals, was adopted; and as it was exceedingly annoying to them, they made the greater despatch, such persons being selected as were not expected to live long, and in whose choice it was the most easy to unite. In the single year 1276, three popes followed in quick succession one after the other. The third of these, John the Twenty-First, was, by the influence of the cardinals, induced to suspend an arrangement of the conclave which they felt to be so inconvenient. The consequence was, that in the year 1292 the election of a pope was delayed by parties among the cardinals two years and a quarter. At length, compelled by the influence of Charles the Second, king of Naples, and to get rid of a disgraceful dependence on him, in which they found themselves placed, they resolved to choose somebody, and, as they could agree on no one else, their choice fell on a man, who under any other circumstances they would hardly have thought of, and who turned a direct contrast to his predecessor. This

was Peter of Morone, a pious anchorite, who lived not far from Sulmone, in the Neapolitan territory,—an old man, who from his twentieth year had led a solitary life, devoted to prayer and religious contemplation,\* and had composed a few small tracts on ascetical subjects and on ecclesiastical law.† Against his wishes he was obliged to exchange the tranquillity of the contemplative life for a sphere of action of the most enormous extent and full of unrest. He called himself Celestin the Fifth. Even when pope, he still wore his monkish dress under the papal insignia. His appearance and deportment, forming so striking a contrast with that of the other popes of this time, procured for him the more respect and veneration. Seated upon an ass, which the kings of Sicily and Hungary led by the bridle, he made his entry into the city of Aquila. Thousands flocked about him, not as they did around other new popes, to obtain rich benefices, but to receive his blessing. The shouts of the multitudes, who gathered from city and country, compelled him to show himself frequently at the window and bestow his blessing.‡ But when Celestin, the feeble old man, came to be placed in circumstances so little conformable to his habits and temperament; when he was set down in the midst of a vast circle of business with which he was entirely unacquainted; he soon brought affairs into the most vexatious perplexity. Always following the direction of the papal officials, he subscribed and affixed the papal seal to rolls of parchment, negligently read or even not written on, which could be filled up at pleasure; he made himself dependent on king Charles the Second, who persuaded him to fix his seat in his own residential city. The cardinals grew tired of him; it was easy for them to excite scruples of conscience in his mind; and, besides, he longed to be restored to his

\* He himself wrote an account of his youth, his inward conflicts and visions, in the commencement of his spiritual career: See *Acta Sanctor. Maj. T. IV. f. 422.*

† These writings, which are of no particular importance, are published in the *Bibl. patr. Lugdunens. T. XXV.*

‡ Benedict Cajetan relates this in his life of Celestin: *Tantus fuit concursus ad ipsum de villis et castris, quod stupor erat videre, quia magis veniebant ad suam obtinendam benedictionem, quam pro præbendæ acquisitione, unde oportebat eum sæpius ad fenestram accedere, ad benedicendum populum victus ipsorum clamoribus, quod et ego vidi et præsens fui quando ista fiebant.* See *Acta Sanctor. Maj. T. IV. f. 427.*

former quiet. Gladly would he have resigned his seat; but on the principles of the church constitution and of the ecclesiastical laws as then understood, it was very difficult to see how the pope, who was invested with the highest dignity on earth, could be divested of his office, or could voluntarily resign it. Yet cardinal Benedict Cajetan, than whom no one could be more unlike this pope in temper and disposition, and who himself aspired to the papal dignity, strengthened him in his inclination; so, after having published by the advice of the latter, an ordinance, purporting that it was allowable for a pope to abdicate his office, he laid down his own in the year 1294, and returned to his former mode of life.

It will be evident from this history of the papacy that, from the time of Gregory the Seventh, it had come into a new relation with the rest of the church. Not only was it assumed, as it had been already in the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals, that the form of the government of the church is *monarchical*; but the government became an *unlimited monarchy*;—the triumph of papal absolutism was complete. All other ecclesiastical authority was but the pope's organ, was valid only to the extent he might choose. No longer tied by the old ecclesiastical laws, he could render them powerless by dispensations, explanations, and laws newly enacted. There were, indeed, distinguished men, and zealous for the well-being of the church, who—much as they were devoted in other respects to the interest of the papacy, or rather because they were so—often took pains to remind the popes that they *must* fix limits to their own authority, which had not been limited from without, by reason of the end for which such authority had been conferred. Thus, for example, bishop Yves of Chartres, declared, “That the Roman church had received no authority from God for injustice,—no authority to take away from any man his guilt, but only to bind what ought to be bound, and to loose what ought to be loosed.”\* The abbot Gottfried of Vendome, also, against whom Yves had cited this principle, because in a particular case he would acknowledge *dependence only on the Roman Church*,—admitted the same as an undeniable truth.†

\* Nullam injustam potestatem, fidem violandi videlicet debita sua cuique non reddendi; sed tantum, quæ sunt liganda ligandi et quæ sunt solvenda solvendi. See ep. 195.

† Quis enim insanus credere vel cogitare audeat, bonum Deum aliquid

"One thing only," he said, "might be disputed, namely, whether, in the particular case in question, the pope had made such arbitrary use of his authority." The abbot Peter of Cluny reminded pope Innocent the Second,\* that if he ruled over all, it should be his glory to be ruled himself only by reason.† We have already quoted the sayings of abbot Bernard of Clairvaux on this subject, namely, that popes were created not to dissolve the ecclesiastical laws, but to see that they were executed. John of Salisbury, that zealous champion of the hierarchy, wrote thus to pope Alexander the Third, in the name of the archbishop of Canterbury:‡ "Undoubtedly, to the pope, all things are allowable; that is, all things that belong by divine right to ecclesiastical authority. He is free to make new laws and to do away the old ones; only it is not in his power to change anything which, by the word of God, has eternal validity. I might venture to assert that not even Peter himself can absolve any one from his guilt who perseveres in sin or in the will to sin; that even he has received no such key as gives him power to open the door of the kingdom of heaven for an impenitent person."

Still, in such voices, it was but a force of moral sentiment that opposed itself to the arbitrary will of the pope. There was no higher authority, which the popes were obliged to respect, which presented to them checks from without, and could have jurisdiction over them. The general councils, which constituted the highest tribunal and the highest legislative authority in the ancient church, had themselves become converted into blind tools of the popes. Such authority in the hands of a single man, standing at the head of the whole Western church, might undoubtedly, in the then rude condition of the nations, be productive of much good, as a check on the trifling caprices of secular rulers, and as a terror to the vast multitude of negligent bishops; but even in the best use of that authority the free original development could not fail to suffer a check. This check, *in the best use of the papal power*, would of necessity become the stronger, inasmuch as, in

unquam injuste dedisse aut ejus sanctam ecclesiam quicquam ab eo injuste accepisse. Epp. 1. ii. 11.

\* Ep. ii. 28.

† Cum jure majestas apostolica omnibus dominetur, soli tantum rationi subjei gloriatur.

‡ Ep. 193.

such a case, the reaction favourable to the upward struggle for freedom would be less powerfully called forth. Naturally, however, such power in the hands of an individual was liable to manifold abuses. In order that the papacy might ever subserve the end for which it was designed, an harmonious combination of the highest mental and moral powers, purity of heart united with great intellectual superiority, was absolutely required; and such a combination could not often occur. Add to this that already, in the twelfth century, a too-powerful secular tendency had grown up within the pale of the papacy, which threatened to swallow up the spiritual interest. Already must the provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg complain, that the *ecclesia Romana* had become a *curia Romana*,\* and we have already heard the complaints of the abbot Bernard on the secularization of the papacy. Every corrupt practice, which was accustomed to prevail in courts, reigned at the Roman court;†

\* The provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg had, as he says, laid at the feet of pope Eugene the Third, his Essay on the Confusion between Babylon and Jerusalem, from which grew afterwards his work so often cited: "De corrupto ecclesiæ statu," or, "expositio in Ps. lxiiv." in Baluz, Miscellan. T. V. Hac intentione, ut curia illa semetipsam attenderet seseque pariter et ecclesiam totam, quam regere debet, a confusione Babylonica distinctam exhibere satageret sine macula et ruga *neque enim vel hoc ipsum carere macula videtur, quod nunc dicitur curia Romana*, quæ antehac dicebatur ecclesia Romana, c. lxiii.

† John of Salisbury, who stood on terms of intimacy with pope Adrian the Fourth, relates a remarkable conversation which he once had with that pope. The pontiff inquired of him respecting the general tone of feeling towards the Romish church, and towards himself; and he frankly stated to him the complaints concerning the exactions that proceeded from the church of Rome. Sicut enim dicebatur a multis Romana ecclesia, quæ mater omnium ecclesiarum est, se non tam matrem exhibet aliis, quam novercam. Sedent in ea Scribæ et Pharisei, ponentes onera importabilia in humeris hominum, quæ digito non contingunt. Concutiunt ecclesias, lites excitant, collidunt clerum et populum, laboribus et miseriis afflictorum nequaquam compatiuntur, ecclesiarum lætantur spoliis et quæstum omnem reputant pietatem. Omnia cum pretio hodie, sed nec cras aliquid sine pretio obtinebis. Nocent sæpius et in eo dæmones imitantur, quod tunc prodesse putantur, cum nocere desistunt exceptis paucis, qui nomen et officium pastoris implent. The pope calmly listened to all he had to say, and thanked him for his frankness; and after having conceded some things and justified others, concluded with an apology like the following: All the members of the body complained of the stomach, that whilst they were all obliged to labour for that, the stomach was idle, and did nothing but consume what was furnished to it by the labour of all the other members. They declared it the enemy of all, and determined to punish it, to rest from

and if the Hildebrandian tendency of reform had aimed to bring back the church to its purely spiritual character, to deliver it from the yoke of secularization, yet this secularization sprung up again in another form, from the mixing up together of court and church in Rome. The complaints about the corruptibility of the Roman court, of the officials by whom the judgment of the pope was influenced or determined,—these complaints, which we have already noticed as existing in the preceding periods, only went on multiplying with the increased influence of the papacy. It must have appeared strange, that on the very spot where simony, as practised by the princes and bishops, was so vigorously combated, the same thing, though under more specious names, should prevail to no less an extent. When the odious charge was issued from Rome against bishop Yves of Chartres, that simony reigned openly in his church, he replied: “He had not as yet been able to do anything towards suppressing the ancient custom by which the candidates for a canonry must pay something to the deans and the cantor; for men appealed to the example of the Romish church itself, where the *cubicularii* and *ministri sacri palatii* demanded no small sum of money for the consecration of bishops and abbots, under the specious names of an *oblatio* or a *benedictio*.\* Not the stroke of a pen, not a sheet of paper, was to be had for nothing. He knew not how to answer those who brought this matter against him, except in the words of Christ: “All whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their

their labours and starve it out. Thus passed several days, till all the members had become quite faint, and were no longer able to perform their appropriate functions. They were now under the necessity of holding another consultation; they found out that, in consequence of withholding everything from the stomach, that organ had been unable to supply them any longer with what was requisite to give them strength and vigour. They found themselves compelled, therefore, to restore back to it all they had withheld, and now the members were strong and vigorous again, and peace was restored to the whole. So it was with those who ruled in the church or in the state. Although they required much, yet it was not for their own advantage, but for the good of the whole. If they were not rich and mighty themselves, they could not help the members. *Noli ergo neque nostrum neque sæcularium principum duritiam metiri, sed omnium utilitatem attende.* See Joh. Saresberiensis Polieraticus sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum, L. VI, c. xxiv.

\* Quæ oblationis vel benedictionis nomine palliantur. Ep. 133.



works." Matth. xxiii. 3. Disputes about election in churches and covenants carried up to Rome for decision, were welcomed there by those whose only object was money, because the contending parties must resort to gold in order to effect their object; \* the officers of the papal court were bribed by presents or promises, and then sought to mislead the judgment of the pope. This was the ordinary way of gaining a bad cause.† Surrounded by such a swarm of corrupt courtiers, it was not enough, therefore, that the individual who stood at the head should be rigidly incorruptible and disinterested. Eugene the Third is extolled as a model in this respect;‡ but he should also possess the power of control over the corrupt creatures around him, and wisdom to detect the fraudulent acts by which truth was kept back from him. Bernard had good reason, therefore, for remarking to this very Eugene: "Of what avail is the good disposition of the individual, when still the bad disposition of others predominates!"

\* We present a few examples. Near the close of the twelfth century Peter de Blois complains of the fact that a *homo illiteratus et laicus, sed in emendis honoribus circumspectus*, was endeavouring by means of his gold to establish in Rome his illegal claims to an abbot's place in Canterbury. He was there received in a friendly manner by those, *qui sicut scitis gratius acceptant hominum munera, quam merita personarum*. *Sperabant enim, quod promotio ejus esset rixæ materia et majoris emolumenti occasio*. His party exerted themselves to the utmost to make themselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness at the Roman court, and thereby to nullify the just charges brought against this man (*opinionis et infamie vulneribus vinum et oleum infundere*). Exhaustis itaque Flandriæ mercatoribus in argento, a Romanis tandem infinitam multitudinem auri mutuavit. Ep. 158. The abbot Guibert, of Novigentum, says, in his autobiography, in the beginning of the twelfth century, L. III. c. iv. f. 498, concerning the palatinis Papæ: *Quibus moris est, ut audito auri nomine mansuescant*. A bishop who was suspected, on good reasons, of having committed a murder for the sake of revenge, found means to clear himself, *adulatione donorum*, at the Roman court, under pope Paschalis the Second.

† Ep. 87. Of bishop Yves of Chartres, John of Salisbury writes (ep. 222): *Romanos amicis verba dare jam nemo miratur, quia percelebre est, et innotuit universis, quod apud eos, quantum quisque nummorum habet in arca, tantum habet et fidei, et plerumque obliquata mente legum et canonum, qui munere potior est, potentior est jure*.

‡ A prior, whose case he had not yet examined, once pressed him to accept from him a mark of gold, as a testimony of regard; but he declined, saying, "Thou hast not as yet stepped into the house, and already wouldst thou bribe the master?" Joh. Saresb. Policrat. L. V. cxv.

We shall now proceed to consider the several branches of the papal authority, as they were separately exercised by themselves.

## II. DISTINCT BRANCHES OF THE PAPAL CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

Important effects undoubtedly resulted from the fact that the popes visited particular countries in person, and spent some time in them.\* We have seen how the events which compelled them to take refuge in France operated in giving a new spring to their authority; still, the cases were quite rare in which they could obtain, by their personal presence, a knowledge of the condition of particular nations and churches, counteract abuses which had crept in, and lend force to their laws. There was need of a permanent and general order of men, to serve as a substitute for the immediate personal presence of the pope. To this end served the cardinals, or other persons from the clergy, clothed with plenary powers, who, under the name of legates, were sent to all quarters of the world. To be sure, a legate whose knowledge of the country was only such as could be derived from a transient residence in it, and from superficial observation, might easily be deceived by appearances; for which reason, Yves of Chartres wished that the popes would, as was sometimes done indeed, appoint as their legates the bishops in the countries themselves, who would be accurately acquainted with the region and its relations.† Against this well-meant proposal, however, it might be objected, that native legates were more exposed than foreign ones to the influence of impure motives and considerations,—which difficulty might be illustrated by examples.

Much could be effected in these times by a legate who, as

\* This subject, the influence which proceeded from the journeyings of the popes in the Middle Ages, deserved certainly to be more accurately investigated in a fuller Monography than Johann von Müller's Essay, *Von den Reisen der Päpste*.

† Cum enim a latere vestro mittitis ad nos cardinales vestros, quia in transitu apud nos sunt, non tantum non possunt curanda curare, sed nec curanda prospicere; hence, ut alicui transalpino legationem sedis apostolicæ injungatis, qui et vicinius subrepentia mala cognoscat et ea vel per se vel per relationem ad sedem apostolicam maturius curare prævaleat. Vol. VIII. Ep. 109.

Bernard required, should interest himself for the people and the poor in their spiritual and bodily necessities, steadfastly oppose himself to the arbitrary will of the mighty, and everywhere promote the supremacy of order and of law.\* Bernard cites examples of such legates, who avoided the very appearance of self-interest. A certain cardinal, Martin, returned back from a very distant country to Italy so poor that, in Florence, he found himself without money or means to continue his journey except on foot; whereupon the bishop of Florence made him a present of a horse. He next met with this bishop in Pisa, where the papal court then resided; and here, being told that the bishop had a process going on and was depending upon his vote, he gave the horse back to him on the spot. Bishop Gottfried of Chartres refused to accept from a priest the present of a costly fish, except on condition that he might be allowed to pay the price of it. But Bernard, in relating these facts, could not help exclaiming, "Does it not seem like a story of some other world, that a legate should return with his purse empty of gold, from the very land of gold?" He had himself to complain of a legate, who, in Germany and France, left everywhere behind him the marks of his wickedness, † everywhere sought to place beautiful boys in high offices in the church, and everywhere made such exactions, that many preferred *purchasing a release from him, that he might not near them*. Bishop Yves of Chartres invites pope Urban the Second to send on a legate, because there was special need of a person clothed with such authority, when arbitrary will everywhere ruled supreme; when there was nothing which any man might not dare to do, and dare with impunity; but, at the same time, he asked for a legate of good name and reputation, who would seek not his own, but the things of Jesus Christ. ‡ The same bishop wrote to a legate a beautiful letter, § reproving him for his inconsistency in zealously contending against lay-investiture, while he did not give himself the least concern with many

\* Qui vulgus non spernant, sed doceant, divites non palpent, sed ter-reant, minas principum non paveant, sed contemnant, gloriantes, non quod curiosa seu pretiosa quaque in terram attulerint, sed quod relique-rint pacem regnis, legem barbaris, quietem monasteriis, ecclesiis ordinem, clericis disciplinam. De considerat. L. IV. c. iv.

† Vir apostolicus replevit omnia non evangelio, sed sacrilegio. Ep. 290.

‡ Ep. 12.

§ Ep. 60.

openly prevailing vices. "He wished," he said, "with many pious men, that the servants of the Romish church would, like experienced physicians, seek first to heal the greater disorders, and not give occasion for their banterers to say that they strained at gnats and swallowed camels.

Under this head belongs, again, the authority exercised by the Roman curia, as the highest tribunal; a tribunal, to which appeal could be made from the whole of Western Christendom, in all matters that stood in any relation whatsoever to the church. Salutory as this branch of the papal authority, rightly used, might have proved, it would in the same proportion turn out hurtful when every appeal was received without discrimination at Rome, and corruption by bribes, partiality, zeal—not for justice and law—but only for ambitious projects and the dignity of the church of Rome, prevailed there; when, as men were forced to complain was really the case, he who appealed to the ecclesiastical laws, instead of leaving everything to depend solely on the plenary power of the pope, was already put down as an enemy of that church.\* In this way appeals would necessarily result in effects directly contrary to the end for which they were instituted. They no longer served the purpose of procuring protection for the weak and oppressed against the will of the mighty, but much more of securing for arbitrary power a convenient handle by which to thwart the execution of the laws and defeat the ends of justice. Every sentence, however just and lawful, could, by an arbitrary appeal on the part of him whose selfish interests it opposed, or whose sole object it was to revenge himself on an enemy, be either reversed, or at least seriously retarded in its execution. As early as the year 1129, Hildebert, bishop of Mans, found cause for declaring, in a free-spirited letter to the pope Honorius the Second, that all church discipline would come to an end, all vices must get the upper hand, if, as the case had hitherto been, every appeal should without distinction be admitted at Rome; he calls upon him to provide that appeals, without good reasons

\* Yves of Chartres, ep. 67. Peter of Blois, ep. 158: *Leges et canones et quicquid de sacro eloquio ad nostræ partis assertionem poteramus inducere, funestum et sacrilegum reputabant nosque hostes Romanæ ecclesiæ publice judicabant.* Men were not to cite any canones, or leges, but only (papal) privilege.

assigned, and that aimed only to procure delay of justice, should be wholly rejected.\* Bernard advised pope Eugene the Third not to listen to every man's story, but sometimes to strike in with the rod.† Men came at length to perceive, therefore, in Rome itself, the necessity of setting limits to arbitrary appeals. The eminent wisdom of Innocent the Third as a ruler was shown in this matter as well as in others; while at the same time, however, his ordinances testify of the enormous abuses which were practised in the matter of appeals.‡ He directed, at the fourth Lateran council, A.D. 1215, that bishops should not be hindered by any appeal from punishing the transgression of their subjects, and from the reformation of their dioceses, unless they had violated the legal forms.§

As by the Hildebrandian system the whole government of the church was placed in the hands of the pope, and the bishops were to exercise some part of it only as his instruments; so it was but a consistent application of the principles contained in that system when bishops, by the act of their institution, by the predicate they bestowed on themselves, came to be placed more and more in a relation of dependence on these unlimited rulers of the church. Had it not been for the reaction of the old ecclesiastical laws, which were still valid in church practice, the consequences flowing out of that system would have been realized much earlier than they were. That no choice of a bishop could be valid without the pope's confirmation was, properly, but a necessary deduction from that system; still, however, it came to be so considered only by slow degrees. Disputes on the choice of bishops furnished occasion, for the most part, for the practice of the individuals elected going themselves to Rome to secure the confirmation

\* *Moratorias appellationes et superfluas omnino a vestra elongandas esse audientia.* Ep. 41.

† *Non semper præbere aurem, quæ audiat, sed aliquando et flagellum quod feriat.*

‡ E. g. epp. ii. 13. *Benignitate juris plurimi hodie abutentes in sui erroris defensionem assumunt, quod in gravaminum fuerat revelationem inventum, et ut suorum superiorum correctionem eludant, sine causa frequenter ad apostolicam sedem appellant.* cf. i. 237; ii. 99; v. 23.

§ *Ut correctionis et reformationis officium libere valeant exercere, decernimus, ut executionem ipsorum nulla appellatio valeat impedire, nisi formam excesserint in talibus observandam, c. vii.*

of their election ; and thus this papal confirmation came more and more into use in the course of the thirteenth century. The formulary which designated bishops as appointed by the grace of God, was increased by adding, “ and by the grace of the apostolical chair.” At length, they were bound by oath to such obedience to the popes as vassals paid to their liege lords. This oath was similar to the one which Boniface first took, to the pope. From the time of Gregory the Seventh, the Italian metropolitans immediately subordinate to the church of Rome placed themselves under such an oath ; next, it was required of all metropolitans that received the pall from Rome ; finally, of all bishops whatsoever. They bound themselves thereby to appear at every synod when cited by the popes ; to keep secret whatever might be communicated to them either orally or in writing, by the popes ; to treat the Roman legates with honour and respect ; to provide them with everything they needed ; and in all cases of necessity to stand by the popes with force of arms.

The popes, who at first contended against arbitrary appointments to church offices by princes, afterwards became chargeable themselves with the same arbitrary mode of procedure, to the great injury of the churches. It was first, in the twelfth century, that they recommended, by way of petition, to vacant benefices individuals who had done eminent service for the Romish church. (Their recommendations still appear under the modest name of *preces* ; hence the persons recommended, are called *precistæ*.) But in the beginning of the thirteenth century these *preces* were changed into *mandata* ; and, finally, the popes of this century took the liberty to supersede all other rights (by the formula “ *non obstante* ”), and to promote their favourites to vacant benefices in whatsoever country they might be found ; insisting, with a threat of the ban, that their commands should be obeyed, as we have seen in the case of Robert, bishop of Lincoln. Thus could the most unfit and the most unworthy men be promoted to such offices ; boys under age, or at least such as were entirely ignorant of the language and manners of the people where their field of action was assigned ; men who carried with them, wherever they went, all the Roman corruption of morals ; or who, if they preferred to enjoy as absentees the revenues of the benefices, hired underlings who performed the spiritual functions in an

altogether mechanical manner. The best use which the popes made of this authority was when they provided in this way for men who had done good service in the cultivation of letters, an appointment free from cares, which they could not otherwise have obtained.

We have seen already, in the preceding period, how the papal power was advanced by the selfish interests of subordinate ecclesiastical authorities, who sought to make themselves independent of their immediate superiors; but when the popes, instead of keeping every other authority confined within its appropriate limits, and placing themselves in opposition to all arbitrary procedures, now sought to grasp all other power for themselves; when, to secure this end, they eagerly complied with the demands of those who wished to be freed from the troublesome oversight of their immediate superiors, the inevitable result was, the destruction of all ecclesiastical order, and the promotion of all licentiousness. Thus abbots procured for themselves the insignia of the episcopal office—sandals, mitre, and crosier; and privileges of exemption in respect to the diocesan authority of the bishops. Thus was taken away from the bishops the means of watching over all that transpired in their dioceses, and of punishing everything bad in them. We have seen on a former page how Bernard warned the pope against this arbitrary extension of his authority; and many other influential voices were heard in like manner to protest against these exemption-privileges. Thus Yves, bishop of Chartres,\* complains to pope Urban the Second of a monastery which sought to free itself by such an exemption from the diocesan oversight of the bishop of Paris, in order that it might suffer no disturbance in its licentious doings.† Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, in a letter filled with similar complaints, addressed to Pope Alexander the Third,‡ quotes the language of one of these abbots who

\* Ep. 65.

† *Latiniacensis abbas et monachi ejus, qui nescio qua nova libertate suos excessus tuentur, et subjectionem Parisiensi ecclesiæ debitam et hactenus exhibitam contra canonicam institutionem de service sua excutere moliantur. Hæ autem personæ hujus modi sunt, quibus magis necessaria est subjectio quam libertas, qui libertate in occasionem carnis abutuntur, quibus si decem millia pædagogorum in Christo ad custodiam deputarentur, vix tamen sic regularis continentia legibus ligarentur.*

‡ Ep. 68. Among the letters of Peter of Blois.

was striving to throw off the regular dependence on his bishop. He said: "The abbots who do not annihilate the authority of the bishops are poor creatures; for, by the annual payment at Rome of an ounce of gold they might obtain exemption." "The abbots," says that archbishop, "exalt themselves above their primates and bishops; and not a man of them is willing to pay due regard to his superior. Thus abbots and monks would abandon themselves to all their lusts, with none to remind them of their duty, and every species of disorder would spread through the monasteries.\* If a speedy remedy were not applied to this evil, it was to be feared that, as the abbots were exempted from the oversight of the bishops, so the bishops would be exempted from that of the archbishops, and the deans and archdeacons from that of their superiors." "To express our own opinion freely," says he, "it does little honour to the pope's justice, for him to confer a benefit on one person at the cost of another; to take what is mine, and render himself chargeable with doing in ecclesiastical affairs that which no secular power would take the liberty of doing in secular affairs." He reminds him, as Bernard had reminded pope Eugene, of the precept of the apostle Paul (Rom. xiii. 1), that every man should be subject to the powers that be. "In the human body, one member does not decline serving another. Among the angels *one* desired exemption from the divine authority, and, from an angel, he become a devil." He acknowledges, that such exemptions had been originally granted to the monasteries to secure quiet for them, to protect them against the tyranny of bishops; but the matter had now taken an opposite turn. Many were at the present time brought to ruin by these extraordinary liberties. To be sure, one who so firmly resisted the arbitrary proceedings of Rome would necessarily draw upon himself the charge of presumption, for daring to attack the sacred authority of the pope.† Peter of Blois congratulates

\* *Abbates exterius curam carnis in desideriis agunt, non curantes, dummodo laute exhibeantur, et fiat pax in diebus, eorum claustrales vero tanquam acephali otio vacant et vaniloquio, nec enim præsidem habent, qui eos ad frugem vite melioris inclinet. Quodsi tumultuosas eorum contentiones audiretis, claustrum non multum differre putaretis a foro.*

† *De facto summi pontificis disputasse et sacrilegium commisisse dicemur; verumtamen non est æqua disputatio, ubi sustinenti respondere non licet.*



his brother, an abbot, who had received from the pope those badges of the episcopal dignity, together with the exemption, on the promotion he had obtained; but at the same time expresses his dissatisfaction that he should consent to wear the signs of a dignity which belonged only to the bishop, and which, on another functionary, savoured of vanity and arrogance.\* He tells him that disobedience to his lawful superior was not to be excused even by the papal privilege; for a privilege bestowed by a man could avail nothing against the divine order.† That pious theologian of Paris, who was so zealous in opposing the abuses of the church near the close of the twelfth century, Peter Cantor, expresses a fear that such partial exemption and partitions would pave the way for the universal downfall of the spiritual empire of Rome, which was to take place in the last times.‡ It is singular, however, at the same time, to observe how this man, otherwise so liberal-minded, —in intimating, that by such a mode of procedure the whole ancient constitution of the church was overthrown, and everything made solely and directly dependent on the supreme authority of the pope,—yet, at the same time, feels constrained to defend himself against the charge of violating the papal majesty; declaring that, beyond a doubt, no person was competent to judge over the pope, and that the apostolical chair, which could not err, may perhaps have acted in such things by a particular illumination. We might be almost tempted to regard such declarations as irony, if the whole tone of the work, and of the passage in question, did not contradict such a supposition.§

\* *Insignia episcopalis eminentiæ in abbate nec approbo nec accepto. Mitra enim et annulus atque sandalia in alio quam in episcopo quædam superba elatio est et præsumtuosa ostentatio libertatis. Ep. 90.*

† *Nec blandiatur sibi aliquis, quod per privilegium Romanæ ecclesiæ ab inobedientia excusetur. Si enim præcipit Deus et aliud indulget et præcipit homo, obediendum est Deo potius quam homini.*

‡ *Verendum est, ne hæ exemptiones et divisiones particulares universalem faciant divisionem a Romano regno spirituali, quæ facta est jam ex parte a Romano regno materiali. 2 Thess. ii. 3. See Petri Cantoris verbum abbreviatum. Montibus, 1639, p. 114.*

§ *Sed dicitur mihi, Ps. lxii. Os tuum ponis in cælum, Respondeo: non. Hoc autem non asserendo, sed opponendo induco. Non enim licet mihi dicere domino papæ: Cur ita facis? Sacrilegium enim est, opera ejus redarguere et vituperare. Verumtamen horum solutionem vel qua ratione iis obviatur, non video. Scio autem, quia auctoritate canonis veteris vel*

In France, some after-effects of that spirit of church freedom, which we observed there in the earlier centuries, still manifested themselves in the way in which the church of this country sought to preserve itself by the so-called *pragmatic sanction*, enacted by king Louis the Ninth, in the year 1268, against several of the oppressive and restrictive measures which have just been mentioned.

The change which had taken place in the supreme government of the church necessarily brought along with it a change also in many things connected with legislation, in all parts of the church; and hence, the old collections of ecclesiastical laws no longer met the existing wants. Ever since the pseudo-Isidorian decretals began to be received as valid, men would already come to be sensible of this. The collision between the old and the new church legislation would occasion considerable embarrassment. Since the establishment of the validity of those decretals, several new collections of ecclesiastical laws had, it is true, been formed; as, for example, that of Regino, abbot of Prüm, in the tenth, and that of Burkhard, bishop of Worms, and that of Yves, bishop of Chartres, in the eleventh century; but still, these collections did not prove adequate to do away that contrariety. Add to this, that the new papal church system needed some counterpoise against a tendency which threatened to become dangerous to it. In the twelfth century, great enthusiasm was excited for the renewed study of the Roman law, by the famous Irnerius (Guarnerius), at the university of Bologna; and this study led to investigations and doctrines which were quite unfavourable to the interests of the papacy. Even Irnerius stood forth as an ally of the imperial power, in the contest with the papacy,\* and it was, in fact, the famous teachers of law at that university who were employed by the emperor Frederic the First to investigate and defend his rights at the diet of Roncala. The more eager,

novi non fit hujusmodi divisio et exemptio in ecclesia sed speciali auctoritate sedis apostolica, quam non patitur Dominus errare. Forte enim instinctu et familiari consilio Spiritus Sancti legeque privata ducta hoc facit, sicut Samson se cum hostibus occidit, sed sic sublatis sunt consules et proconsules de medio, ut pauca vel nulla imperent et omnia Cesar sit, qui omnia sicut omnibus imperet.

\* Landulph. Junior. hist. Mediolan. c. xxx. Muratori, Scriptor. rer. Italicar. T. V. f. 502.

therefore, would be the hierarchical party to oppose that hostile tendency, by setting up another, in defence of their own interests and principles, through the study of ecclesiastical law from an opposite point of view. Thus it came about that—at the famous seat itself of the study of the Roman law—at Bologna, about the year 1151, a Benedictine, or, according to another account, a Camaldulensian monk, Gratian, arranged a new collection of ecclesiastical laws, better suited to the wants of the church and to the scientific taste of these times. As the title itself indicates, “*Concordia discordantium canonum*,” old and new ecclesiastical laws were here brought together, their differences discussed, and their reconciliation attempted—a method similar to that employed by Peter Lombard in handling the doctrines of faith. This logical arrangement and method of reconciliation supplied a welcome nutriment to the prevailing scientific spirit. From that time the study also of canon law was pursued with great zeal, and the two parties called the Legists and the Decretists arose—Gratian’s collections of laws being denominated simply the “*Decretum Gratiani*.” The zeal with which the study of civil and ecclesiastical law was pursued had however this injurious effect, that the clergy were thereby drawn away from the study of the Bible, and from the higher, directly theological interest, and their whole life devoted solely to these pursuits.\*

But still the contrariety between the old and the new ecclesiastical laws could not be got rid of by this attempt at reconciliation. Many doubts and difficulties arose from this cause; and the popes were applied to for a decision of the contested questions which resulted therefrom. In the laws enacted by them, the ecclesiastical laws received great additions; as, for example, in the decisions of Innocent the Third, in particular, which formed a rich storehouse for that code; but a twofold injury resulted. An intermediate authority was wanting to introduce the new papal laws at once into the practice of the church; and in the twelfth century many bulls were interpolated, under the name of the popes, to subserve particular interests. People returning from a pilgrimage

\* Peter Cantor complains, in his *Verbum abbreviatum*, c. li.: *Omissis artibus liberalibus cœlestibusque disciplinis omnes codicem legunt et forensia quærunt, ut gloriam et lucrum mendicent.* Compare, in the letters of Peter de Blois, epistles 76 and 140.

to Rome, brought with them interpolated bulls, and put them in circulation.\* In the time of Innocent the Third, a forger of this sort had the boldness to appear in Sweden, in the character of a papal legate.† There were ecclesiastics who had acquired a peculiar knack in imitating papal bulls, and pushed a lucrative business in that line.‡ Thus many bad things could be done in the names of the popes for which they were not in the least responsible,—an evil of which Innocent the Third felt it necessary to complain.§ In England, near the close of the twelfth century, the ban was for this reason publicly pronounced on falsifiers of the bulls.|| In order to suppress these pernicious acts of imposture, Innocent the Third enacted laws whereby such impostors were condemned to severe punishments, and the marks of distinction between genuine and ungenuine bulls accurately defined.¶ Hence, the still greater need of a new and duly accredited collection for ecclesiastical law, in which the genuine laws might be found brought together. After many previous attempts to supply this want, pope Gregory the Ninth, in the year 1234, caused

\* Innocent the Third, epp. L. II. ep. 29. † L. C. L. VI. ep. 10.

‡ Jacob of Vitry (see ante) names among the bad monks and clergy, who took all sorts of liberty to gratify their cupidity, those qui falsarium crimen pessimum incurrentes, falsis literis et bullis furtivis in perditionem uti non verentur. Hist. occidental. c. xxix.

§ Innocent III. (L. I. ep. 235) says: Dura sæpe mandata et institutiones interdum iniquas a sede apostolica emanare multi arguunt et mirantur et in hoc ei culpam imponunt, in quo sinceritas ejus culpæ prorsus ignara per innocentiam excusatur.

|| Letters of Peter de Blois, ep. 53. It is here said, in an ordinance issued by Richard, archbishop of Canterbury: Quoniam in his partibus publica falsariorum pestis obrepit, qui bullis adulterinis et literis calumnias innocentibus movent et statum juste possidentium subvertere moluntur. And ep. 68: Falsariorum præstigiola malitia ita in episcoporum contumeliam se armavit, ut falsitas in omnium fere monasteriorum exemptione prævaleat. In the letters of John of Salisbury, ep. 83: Hujus sigilli corruptio universalis ecclesiæ periculum est, cum ad unius signaculi notam solvi et claudi possint quorumlibet ora pontificum et culpa quælibet impunita pertranseat et innocentia condemnatur. Unde in eos, qui hoc attentare præsumunt, animadvertendum est sicut in hostes publicos et totius ecclesiæ, quantum in ipsis est, subversores. On the traffic pursued with these forgeries, see, further on, the letter of Stephen of Tournay, ep. 221.

¶ Epp. L. I. ep. 235 and 349, and the other epistles of this pope already referred to.

such a digest to be formed by the general of the Dominicans, Raymund a Pennaforte.\*

### III. REMAINING PARTS OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

It was by the degeneracy of the clergy and the confusion existing in all parts of the church-constitution, that the reforming tendencies of the Hildebrandian epoch had been called forth. A part of the abuses which had crept in, those which the rude arbitrary proceedings of monarchs had introduced, were thoroughly counteracted by the triumph of the Hildebrandian system; a great zeal for the reformation of the clergy and of the church life, after the pattern of the primitive apostolical church, as it presented itself to the imagination of the men of this period, commenced from this epoch. A bond of union was here presented between all the opponents of the reigning corruption, all men in all the churches who were zealous for a strict severity of morals among the clergy, and the worthy celebration of the offices of worship. The provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg represents, as a work of the same spirit, the enthusiasm for the crusades; the zeal of monasticism now carried to an unusual height, and for the renovated canonical mode of living together; the multitudes who contended with secular, and the other multitudes who contended with spiritual weapons for the same holy object.† From this epoch began a fierce struggle between the smaller number of the more strict ecclesiastics, who were disposed to favour reform, and the great majority who followed only their pleasures.

But the measures applied by Gregory the Seventh and his successors were by no means calculated to produce a lasting effect on the vast multitude who were not themselves affected by this spirit of reform. By laws of celibacy, chastity and purity of manners could not be forced on the clergy: men

\* *Decretalium, Libri V*; the Decretals, simply so called.

† He says: *Est grande spectaculum, videre hinc milites in campo pugnantes duce Josua, hinc vero beatum Augustinum quasi alterum Aron stipatum Levitis et sanctum Benedictum quasi Hur, Exod. xvii. 12, stipatum religiosis monachis orantes*;—and again: *Hinc post longam simoniæ hiemem vernali suavitate spirante reflorescit vinea Dominica, constituentur cœnobita et xenodochia et nova crebrescent laudum cantica. In Ps. xxxix. Pez, Thesaurus anecdotor. novissimus, T. V. f. 794.*

contented themselves with a seeming obedience, and those to whom a regular marriage was not allowed, abandoned themselves, in private, to excesses so much the worse,—sought in gorgeous apparel, outward splendour,\* revelry, and noisy amusements, an indemnification for the enjoyments of domestic life, which were forbidden them. The dissolution of the canonical life continually went on increasing. The prebends were by many considered as only a means of good living, and they either did not concern themselves at all about the ecclesiastical functions incumbent on them, or performed them in a mechanical way, without devotion or dignity, or else got them performed by hireling† job-working *substitutes*.‡ Those who would not follow the example of the rest, who exhibited in their whole manner of life a seriousness corresponding to their vocation, who dared to converse about spiritual things, were decried by the latter as singular fellows and pietists;§ or, if they ventured to stand forth as censors, exposed themselves to hatred and persecution; for men dreaded a spirit of reform supported by popes and monarchs which might bring down a severe chastisement on the heads of the corrupt clergy. “Behold,” said the others, “how this man departs from our customs; he wants to convert us into monks. We must at once take our stand against him. If we do not, it will go with us as it has done with others before us. The pope and the king will unite against us, they will deprive us of our livings,

\* In opposition to these, see, e. g., the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, ep. 2, s. 11: *Conceditur tibi, ut si bene deservis, de altario vivis, non autem, ut de altario luxurieris, ut de altario superbias, ut inde compares tibi frena aurea, sellas depictas, calcaria deargentata, varia griseaque pellicea a collo et manibus ornatu purpureo diversificata.*

† We have an example in a church at Gubbio in the twelfth century, in the account of the life of bishop Ubald, written by his successor Tebald: *Nulla tunc temporis ordinis observantia, nulla prorsus religionis colebatur memoria. Mercede annua erat conductus, qui campanas pulsaret in hora officiorum et quia clericorum unusquisque in domo propria epulabatur et dormiebat, tota fere observantia ecclesiastici cultus custodiebatur in pulsu nolarum.* See *Acta Sactor. Mens. Maj. T. III. f. 631.*

‡ Clerici conductores and conductitii, as Gerhoh says in his *Dialog. De differentia clerici sæcularis et regularis.* Pez, *Thes. anecd. noviss. T. II. f. 482.*

§ *Si non facio, quod cæteri, de singularitate notabor.* Bernard. ep. 2, s. 11.

and other fashions will be introduced here. We shall become a laughing-stock to all the people.”\*

When the popes had succeeded in banishing the direct and arbitrary influence of the princes on ecclesiastical appointments, another not less pernicious mode of arbitrary proceeding often took the place of that which had been suppressed. The bishops and chapters of the cathedral often suffered themselves to be determined by family interests and worldly considerations more than by any concern for the good of the church. The older ecclesiastical laws respecting the canonical age were neglected, and boys under age promoted to the first offices of the church.† Canonical priests made it a rule amongst themselves, that none but persons of noble birth should join their class,‡ and so the ostentatious display and luxurious modes of living practised in the higher ranks were introduced amongst the clergy. Nepotism, and the spirit of gain, led to the accumulation of several benefices, often involving the duties of incompatible callings, on one person. Respecting the so-called plurality of benefices, and the non-residence of clergymen near the church with which their official duties were connected, various complaints were offered. Peter Cantor, in the work wherein he combats the ecclesiastical abuses of his times,§ resents it that, in a respectable church, the five offices of greatest income had been given to absentees.|| The popes

\* See *Life of the abbot William Roskild*, who belonged to the times of pope Innocent the Third, in the *Actis Sanctor. M. April. T. I. f. 625*; and what Jacob of Vitry says of those corrupt ecclesiastics: *Hi autem, qui inter eos viri justi et timorati super abominationibus eorum lugent et contristantur, ab iis irridentur. Hypocritas et superstitiosos dicunt, reputantes pro magno crimine, quod divinæ scripturæ verbum vel ipsum Dei nomen inter eos ausi sunt nominare. Hist. occidental. c. xxx.*

† The words of Bernard, in his tract, *De officio episcoporum*, c. vii.: *Scholares pueri et impuberes adolescentes ob sanguinis dignitatem promoveantur ad ecclesiasticas dignitates et de sub ferula transferuntur ad principandum presbyteris, lætiores interim, quod virgas evaserint quam quod meruerint principatum.* The complaints in Peter de Blois, ep. 60: *Episcoporum nequitia, qui circa parentum promotionem sunt adeo singulariter occupati, ut nihil aliud affectent aut somnient, atque indigentiam scholarium vel in modica visitatione non relevel. Purpurata incendit parentela pontificum et elata de patrimonio crucifixi in superbia et in abusione ad omnes vitæ sæcularis illecebras se effundit.*

‡ See, e. g., Yves' letters, ep. 126.

§ The *Verbum Abbreviatum*, already several times referred to.

|| *Pro quibus (reditibus) perceptis in ea nec per vicarium nec per alium*

Alexander the Third and Innocent the Third passed laws at the Lateran general councils, in the years 1179 and 1215, for the suppression of the above-mentioned abuses; but, by all the outward measures that were applied, little could be effected so long as the sources of the evil were still left behind; and the bad example which the arbitrary proceedings of succeeding popes presented would only contribute to promote such abuses. Bishops who had the good of their communities at heart, as, for example, Robert Grosshead, we hear complaining bitterly on this subject.\*

In the contest with the great mass of the secularized clergy stood forth, in the twelfth century, men who sought to bring back the old canonical life to a still greater degree of strictness, to reform the clerical body still more according to the pattern of the monastic life. Such a man was Norbert, the founder of a new and peculiar congregation, which became a place of refuge for many who were dissatisfied with the then existing condition of the clergy. Of him we shall have to speak more at large in the history of monasticism. But there were also other men of the more rigid tendency, who professed no wish of founding a new institution, but only desired to bring back the clergy to a mode of life and of association corresponding to their original destination. Among these, the individual of whom we have so often spoken as an enthusiastic champion of the Hildebrandian system, the provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg, deserves particularly to be mentioned. The greatest part of his life was spent in struggling

*servitur. Non dico, non cantatur, non legitur tantum, sed nec etiam consiliis ejus assissitur, quippe nulla personarum quinque semel in anno præsens in ea invenitur. L. C. c. xxxiv.*

\* See his letter to his archdeacon, ep. 107, in Brown, in which he calls upon him to exercise severity towards the clergy who neglected their duty, and complains of their incontinent lives, their worldly pursuits, and their trifling amusements: *Ex relatu fide digno audivimus, quod plurimi sacerdotes archidiaconatus vestri horas canonicas aut non dicunt aut corrupte dicunt, et id quod dicunt sine omni devotione aut devotionis signo, imo magis cum evidenti ostensione animi indevoti dicunt nec horam observant in dicendo, quæ commodior sit parochianis ad audiendum divina sed quæ eorum plus consonat libidinosæ desidæ. Habent insuper suas focarias, quod etsi nos et nostros lateat cum inquisitiones super ejusmodi fieri fecimus, his per quos fiunt inquisitiones perjuria non timentibus, non debet tamen vos sic latere.*



for the reformation of the *clerus*,\* and the storms which agitated that body proceeded from this very cause—he is in this respect to be compared with Ratherius. The apostolical community of goods, as men conceived it, was to him the type of the union which ought to exist amongst the clergy. The rule ascribed to Augustin, he represented as the law for the community of the clergy; they should own no sort of property; strangers to all luxury and splendour, they should be contented with the simple necessities of life: it was what Arnold of Brescia wanted to bring about, only in a more liberal spirit. To the clerical rule drawn up at Aix-la-Chapelle, Gerhoh referred back, as a lax rule, originating in the court of a prince, not in the church.† Considered from this point of view, those ecclesiastics alone who subjected themselves to this stricter rule, were recognized as genuine canonicals, as *clerici regulares*; all the rest were placed in the class of *irregulares sæculares*—secular clergymen; but among the latter, too, there was a great diversity as to their habits of living. This, even the zealous advocate of the stricter rule, the provost Gerhoh, little as he was inclined to do them justice, was forced to acknowledge.‡ There were, amongst the secular clergy, men of spiritual feelings; and a distinction is to be made between those whom the love of freedom and those whom an inclination to licentiousness led to choose this mode of life; of which latter Jacob of Vitry says, that they were very properly called *canonici sæculares* because they belonged entirely to the *sæculum*—to the world; but that they were incorrectly styled *canonici*, for they led a life altogether without rule or law.§

It so happened, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, that,

\* He has himself related the history of his contests with bishops, canonicals, and princes, in his Commentary on the Psalms. See Pez, Thes. anecd. noviss. T. V. f. 2039.

† Illam clericorum regulam, non in ecclesia, sed in aula regis dictatam. In Ps. lxxviii. Pez, Thes. T. V. f. 1352.

‡ He says: Non eos omnes damnamus, cum ex ipsis agnoscamus aliquos, licet paucos, esse ita disciplinatos, ut licet habeant propria, quasi non habentes, habeant ea et studeant in sectanda morum disciplina. In Ps. lxxvii. l. c. f. 1353.

§ From that better class he distinguishes these: Multi autem temporibus istis reperiuntur canonici vero nomine sæculares, quorum regula est, irregulariter vivere. c. xxx.

from the body of these secular clergymen came individuals awakened to repentance by peculiar impressions upon their minds ; filled with abhorrence of the worldly pursuits of the clergy, they turned all at once to an entirely different mode of life. The duties of the spiritual calling, their guilt in having hitherto so neglected them, pressed with their whole weight upon their consciences : they felt constrained to exert themselves the more earnestly to make good their own deficiencies, and to exhort clergy and laity to repentance, and to a serious Christian deportment. They travelled round as preachers of repentance ; by their words of exhortation, coming warm from the heart, many were moved, awakened to remorse for their sins, and to resolutions of amendment ; though the powerful impressions of the moment did not always endure. A circle of young men was formed around them, and they became the objects of enthusiastic veneration ; by which, however, such of them as lacked firmness of Christian character might easily be intoxicated, and, quitting the paths of humility and discretion, be led into dangerous self-delusions ; so that what had begun in a holy enthusiasm might gradually become vitiated by the intrusion of impure motives.

Near the close of the twelfth century, a great stir was produced in France by a person named Fulco. He was one of the ordinary, ignorant, worldly-minded ecclesiastics, the priest and parson of a country town not far from Paris ; afterwards he experienced a change of the nature we have described, and, as he had before neglected his flock, and injured them by his bad example, so now he sought to build them up by his teaching and example. But he soon became painfully sensible of his want of that knowledge which he had taken no pains to acquire, but which was now indispensable to him in order to instruct his community. In order to supply as far as possible this deficiency, he went on week-days to Paris, and attended the lectures of Peter Cantor, a theologian distinguished for his peculiar scriptural bent, and his tendency to practical reform ; and of the knowledge here acquired he availed himself, by elaborating it into sermons, which he preached on Sundays to his flock. These sermons were not so much distinguished for profoundness of thought as for their adaptation to the common understanding, and to the occasions of practical life. He was a man of the people, and the way in which he spoke made what

he said still more impressive than it would otherwise have been ; hence, when others delivered his copied discourses over again, they failed of producing the same effects.\* At first, neighbouring clergymen invited him to preach before their congregations ; next, he was called to Paris, and he preached not only in churches, but also in the public places. Professors, students, people of all ranks and classes, flocked to hear him. In a coarse cowl, girt about with a thong of leather, he itinerated as a preacher of repentance through France, and fearlessly denounced the reigning vices of learned and unlearned, high and low. His words often wrought such deep compunction, that people scourged themselves, threw themselves on the ground before him, confessed their sins before all, and declared themselves ready to do anything he might direct in order to reform their lives, and to redress the wrongs which they had done. Usurers restored back the interest they had taken ; those who, in times of scarcity, had stored up large quantities of grain, to sell again at a greatly advanced price, threw open their granaries. In such times he frequently exclaimed : " Give food to him who is perishing with hunger, or else thou perishest thyself." He announced to the corn-dealers, that before the coming harvest they would be forced to sell cheap their stored-up grain ; and cheap it soon became, in consequence of his own annunciation. Multitudes of abandoned women, who lived on the wages of sin, were converted by him ; for some he obtained husbands, for others he founded a nunnery. He exposed the impure morals of the clergy ; and the latter, seeing the finger of every man pointed against them, were obliged to separate from their concubines. A curse, that fell from his lips, spread alarm like a thunderbolt. People whom he so addressed were seen to fall like epileptics, foaming at the mouth and distorted with convulsions. Such appearances promoted the faith in the supernatural power of his words. Sick persons were brought to him from all quarters, who expected to be healed by his touch, by his blessing, and wonderful stories were told of the miracles thus wrought.† Men were so eager to obtain a fragment of his

\* See the words of Jacob of Vitry : *Quæ tamen non ita sapiebant in alterius ore nec tantum fructificabant ab aliis prædicata. Hist. occid. p. 287.*

† Deserving of notice are the words of Jacob of Vitry : *Tanta infir-*

clothing, in order to preserve it as a miracle-working relic, that the very garments he wore on his person were often rent in pieces by the multitude. It required strong qualities of mind for a man not to be hurried, by such extravagant veneration paid to himself, into self-forgetfulness and spiritual pride. Pressed by the multitude, in danger of being crushed, Fulco would swing his staff with such violence around him as to wound many within its sweep; but the wounded never uttered a murmuring word, they kissed the blood as it streamed forth under the blow as if they had been healed by the rough touch of the holy man. A person having once rent a fragment from his garment, said he to the multitude, "Tear not my apparel, which has not been blessed," and, signing the cross, he pronounced a blessing on the raiment of the individual who had torn the fragment from his own, and this was now immediately divided up into small pieces, which were looked upon as relics. At length he stood forth as a preacher of the crusades. A great deal of money was sent to him, which he divided amongst the crusaders; yet the vast collections which he made injured his reputation.\*

The personal influence of this man, who stood prominent neither by his talents nor his official station, gave birth to a new life of the clergy, a greater zeal in discharging the duties of the predicatorial office and of the cure of souls, both in France and in England. Young men, who, in the study of a dialectic theology at the University of Paris, had forgotten the obligation to care for the salvation of souls, were touched by the discourses of this unlearned itinerant, and trained by his instrumentality into zealous preachers. He formed, and left behind him, a peculiar school; he sent his disciples over to England, and his example had a stimulating effect even on such as had never come into personal contact with him. "Many," says Jacob of Vitry,† "inflamed with the fire of love, and incited by his example, began to teach and to

morum et eorum, qui eos afferebant, erat fides et devotio, quod non solum servi Dei meritis, sed *servore spiritus et fidei non hesitantis magnitudine* plures sanarentur.

\* Jacobus de Vitriaco, *Hist. occidental.* c. vi. etc.; where we find the story related in full. Rigord, *De gestis Philippi Augusti*, at the year 1195, and the following. Matthew of Paris, year 1197, f. 160.

† *Hist. occidental.* c. ix.

preach, and to lead not a few to repentance, and to snatch the souls of sinners from destruction."

One man of learning, in particular, belonging to the University of Paris, the magister Peter de Rusia (or de Rossiaco), attached himself, as a preacher of repentance, to Fulco, and produced great effects: but although his preaching procured for him rich presents and great marks of honour, he proved unfaithful to his missionary calling by accepting a place as canonical priest and chancellor of the church at Chartres. Such a change in this man made an unfavourable impression on those who were accustomed to reverence in Fulco's disciples only preachers glowing with love for the salvation of the souls of their brethren. An historian of these times remarks, in speaking of the great activity of the above-mentioned preacher, "He who would know in what temper each man preached, must look to the end, for the end most clearly reveals the disposition of the man."\*

These preachers of repentance and reform, who came forth from the very body of the clergy, might be led on by their pious zeal to examine into the grounds and causes of the corruption which they attacked, and to inquire more profoundly into the gospel-truth which was opposed to it. In this way a class of men might be raised up who would attack the reigning church-system, as we shall see in the fourth section, relating to the history of sects.

We must here repeat what we have already said in an earlier period, concerning the exactions and tyranny of the archdeacons, who endeavoured to build up an authority independent of the bishops;† although there were those, too, who distinguished themselves by self-denying love in a devotional and assiduous discharge of the duties of their calling, by unwearied zeal and disinterestedness in making their tours of

\* Sed qui scire desiderat, qua intentione quisque prædicavit, finem attendat, quia finis intentionem hominum manifestissime declarat. Rigord, *De gestis Philippi*, ad a. 1198.

† E. g., John of Salisbury, ep. 80, concerning the rabies archidiaconorum: Aliorum tristitia in eorum gaudium cedit, in quorum manibus iniquitates sunt, et sinistra eorum aut repleta est muneribus aut inhiat. Hæc enim hominum monstra dextras non habent. Sicut enim quidam in virtutis exercitio ambidextri sunt, sic isti ambilævi convincuntur ab avaritia et rapina.

visitation amongst the communities intrusted to their care; men who expended their regular incomes in works of beneficence, and who remained poor in very profitable offices; men who, staff in hand, travelled over their dioceses on foot, preaching the word in every place.\* To oppose, however, the arbitrary proceedings of those archbishops who abused their authority, the bishops, in the course of the twelfth century, employed other proxies in the administration of their jurisdictions, under the name of *officiales*. This title was applied at first, in a more general sense, to denote those who, under various relations, served as deputies and agents of the bishops, and had to manage † various kinds of business in their names.‡ Somewhat later, those who served as deputies of the bishops in the care of souls, § and in the proper spiritual jurisdiction (such officers as Innocent the Third, at the fourth Lateran council, in 1215, ordered to be appointed for the benefit of the larger dioceses neglected by the worldly-minded bishops ||), were distinguished under the name of *vicarii*, from the *officiales*, so called in the narrower sense, to whom was intrusted a coercive jurisdiction. But though a check was thus placed on the arbitrary authority which the archdeacons had arrogated to themselves, and the authority of the bishops preserved against encroachments, yet the communities gained nothing thereby. In place of the exactions,

\* As is related of an archdeacon, Mauritius, in the diocese of Troyes, near the beginning of the thirteenth century, by Thomas Cantipratenus, in his *Bonum Universale*, c. i. p. 6.

† As appertaining to the officium episcopi.

‡ On this point, a passage in the *Verbum Abbreviatum* of Peter Cantor is particularly weighty, c. xxiv. He distinguishes tria genera officiorum: 1. confessor cui episcopus vices suas in spiritualibus, in audiendis confessionibus et curandis animabus committit; 2. quæstor palatii sui, decanus, archipresbyter et hujusmodi, qui incrementis et profectibus causarum et negotiorum episcopi per fas et nefas invigilant; 3. præpositus ruralis primus. He designates as quæstor and præpositus such as had to administer the coercive jurisdiction of the bishop, and who were afterwards called *officiales* in the stricter sense of the word.

§ Those whom Peter Cantor designates with the title of *confessores*.

|| Præcipimus tam in cathedralibus, quam in aliis conventualibus ecclesiis viros idoneos ordinari, quos episcopi possint coadjutores et co-operatores habere, non solum in prædicationis officio, verum etiam in audiendis confessionibus et pœnitentiis injungendis ac cæteris, quæ ad salutem pertinent animarum. c. x.

which the archdeacons had taken the liberty to make on their own score, came others of a different sort, which were practised by the officials, as the organs of the bishops, for the enriching of themselves; so that Peter of Blois, in the last times of the twelfth century, could call these officials by no better name than bishops' bloodsuckers;\* and Peter Cantor complains that the bishops gave themselves but little concern about the men to whom they committed the care of souls, but looked more sharply after those officials in the more limited sense of the word, by whom their coffers were filled. From this it was quite evident how little they loved the souls of men, and their Saviour and upper Shepherd; how much, on the other hand, they loved money.† He pronounces it an abominable thing, that the places of such officials should be farmed out by the bishops for a stipulated sum of money, for these people practised every species of extortion in order to indemnify themselves for the sums they had advanced.‡

The bishops, with the great powers bestowed on them,

\* *Tota officialis intentio est, ut ad opus episcopi suæ jurisdictioni commissas miserrimas oves quasi vice illius tondeat, emungat, excoriet. Isti sunt episcoporum sanguisugæ. Ep. 25.*

† I will, for the benefit of the learned reader, place here the entire passage which is so important a source for the history of these relations: *Præpositus ruralis primus, licet Deo dignior, episcopo tamen est vilior. Cum isto ei est rarus sermo, rara consultatio super reddenda ratione villicationis suæ, super regimine animarum, in quo patet, quantum amabat eas et redemptorem et summum pastorem earum. Cum tortore autem et præposito frequens ei est sermo, ratiocinatio et consultatio. In quo patet, quantum dilexerit pecuniam. Sed et, quod detestabilius est, primum mittit ad officii sui executionem sine magna fidelitatis ejus examinatione præhabita, sine sacramento jurisjurandi de fidelitate ei servanda in regimine animarum interposito. Secundum autem et tertium discutit usque ad unguem, si bene noverint bursas pauperum emungere et cum asportato lucro ad Dominos suos redire, quibus tutelam pecuniæ sine juramento interposito non committit. Horum autem duorum, scilicet quæstoris et præpositi, violentior est quæstor. Præpositus enim sæpius poena certa et definita reum punit. Quæstor vero incerta et voluntaria, pro modica culpa maximam poenam infligens.*

‡ *Quod mirabilius est et execrabilius, illis quæsturam, torturam et exactionem et prælaturam vendit, ad pretium certum committit. Qui ne damnum et detrimentum propriæ pecuniæ incurrant, per omne nefas exactionum, calumniarum, rapinarum laxant retia sua in capturam pecuniarum, prædones effecti potius quam officiales.*

might be instruments of much good, or they might occasion a great deal of mischief. We find examples of both kinds; for along with the great majority of bad bishops, there was a choice set of very good ones, men profoundly penetrated with the spirit of genuine piety, and ready to offer themselves up in every way for the good of their communities. Among the qualities belonging to the exemplary discharge of the bishop's calling, were reckoned zeal in preaching, in caring for souls, and in making church-visitations; impartiality; the union of severity and gentleness in the trials conducted by him; inflexibility to the threats of power in administering punishment to the bad;\* activity in providing for the poor and sick; burial of the poor; restoration of peace among contending parties. Peter, bishop of Moustier en Tarantaise, in Savoy, who administered this office from the year 1142 to 1175, performed all these duties with great diligence in a poor and mountainous diocese. He sought to bring it about that each church of his diocese might possess a silver cup for the communion. Where other means failed, he got an egg to be offered weekly from each house; these eggs he caused to be collected together and sold, till finally the necessary sum was obtained for purchasing a cup for the church where this was done. On his tours of visitation, he took but few companions with him, and those only such as, like himself, would seek to be as little burdensome as possible to the communities. He begged those who entertained him and his companions to give all which they left untouched to his brethren the poor. His house always resembled a poorhouse,—as his biographer relates,—especially during the three months before harvest, when, amongst those barren rocks, the means of subsistence were most difficult to be obtained. A multitude flocked in daily, whom he supplied with bread and herbs, and every year he made a grand and general love-feast. He took pains to search out those who were too infirm to labour, those who were suffering under incurable disorders throughout his whole diocese,—or to cause them to be sought out by others whom he could trust,—and provided them with food and raiment.

\* Accordingly, it was said of such an one: *Nihil ea in re nec minis principium nec tyrannorum sævitia absteritus*. See, e. g., the life of William archbishop of Bourges, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, in the *Actis Sanct. Mens. Januar.* T. I. c. ii. and iii. f. 629.



Those who had no dwellings, no relatives to care for them, he took care to place under the guardianship of faithful and pious persons, with whom they found everything necessary for their comfort. When, in rough winter weather, poor people met him on the mountains, destitute of suitable clothing to protect them from the cold, he shared with them, in case of necessity, the raiment he wore on his own body. In those Alpine regions, where there were no houses to receive wandering travellers, as, for example, on Mount St. Bernard, on the Jura, and on a third mountain, unnamed, he caused such shelters to be erected at his own expense, and took care that every pains should be taken to make them solid and durable. Wherever it was necessary to preach before the better-educated, he turned the duty on others; but he made it a special object of attention himself to preach intelligibly to the common people. He was wont to apply to himself the words of the apostle Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 19,—“I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.” Being a zealous adherent of Alexander the Third, he had to oppose the emperor Frederick the First, in the contested papal election; yet this monarch, who looked with contempt on the clergy that were surrounded with worldly pomp and splendour, felt constrained to honour and spare a spiritual shepherd like him.\*

We have already, on several occasions, remarked of the German bishops, that by their political position, as important members of the empire, they became entangled in a great deal of business foreign to their spiritual office as shepherds, so as to be drawn off by secular affairs from the proper duties of their calling.† Gerhof of Reichersberg looked upon it as a grave violation of the ecclesiastical laws, that bishops should plan campaigns,—deliberate with monarchs on worldly affairs; especially, that they should assist at capital trials. He called

\* *Acta Sanctor. Mens. Maj. T. II. f. 324.*

† The words of a Parisian ecclesiastic: “I can believe almost anything; but I can hardly believe that a German bishop will be saved.” The reason stated is, that German bishops, almost without exception, bear the secular along with the spiritual sword; hold bloody courts; wage war, and feel more solicitude about the pay of their troops than the salvation of souls. See *Cæsar. Heisterbac. Dial. distinct. II. c. xxvi. Bibl. Cisterc. T. II. f. 44.*

it a wretched hypocrisy in these bishops when, in order to show an apparent respect for the ecclesiastical laws, they absented themselves a short time before the close of those bloody trials, after every arrangement had already been made for the sentence which was to be passed. "They do like the Jews," says he, "who declared before Pilate, 'It is not lawful for us to put any man to death,'" John xviii. 31,—meaning that the Roman soldiers should crucify Christ.\* According to *his* view of the church theocracy, the church should exercise only a *moral* oversight over secular affairs, contend only with the sword of the Spirit; and she would be irresistible, as he supposed, if she made use of this weapon alone. She enfeebled herself and her authority when she laid aside the spiritual sword for the secular. Nor did he even spare the popes, whose example might be appealed to in justification of the bishops. Happening to meet pope Eugene the Third, who had returned for the last time to Rome, at Viterbo,—when that pope complained to him of the unfavourable treaty of peace, which, after a large expenditure of money, he had been obliged to conclude with the Romans,—he remarked to him, that "even such a peace was better than the war carried on by him; for," said he, "when the pope prepares to make war with the aid of hireling soldiers, I seem to see Peter before me, drawing his sword from its sheath. But when he comes off the worst in such a contest, I think I hear the voice of Christ, saying to Peter, 'Put up thy sword in its sheath.'"†

As those German bishops must have felt themselves burdened by the duties of their double sphere of action, as their dioceses were of vast extent, and as secular business often occupied more of their time and thoughts than spiritual, so they would naturally welcome any opportunity that might offer itself of procuring such assistants as had received episcopal ordination, and were therefore in a condition to act as their substitutes in the performance of episcopal functions. This opportunity was presented to them by a peculiar train of events in the thirteenth century. When the successful issue

\* De edificio, c. xxxv. Pez. T. II. p. ii. f. 359.

† See Gerhoh's letter to pope Alexander the Third, published by Pez. Thes. anecdot. noviss. T. V. f. 540.

of the first crusades, and the conquest of Constantinople, had extended the empire of the Western church in the East, the popes proceeded to erect bishoprics in those countries; but with the loss of those possessions, the bishoprics also had to be abandoned. Yet the popes would not relinquish their claims to them; but still continued to appoint and consecrate bishops for those lost churches; though in reality they were bishops only in name (*episcopi in partibus infidelium*). Now, in these titular bishops, the German prelates found the very kind of help which they wanted. These ecclesiastics were sent to them as *coadjutores*, suffragan bishops (*suffraganei*); and as pious men were frequently appointed to those places from the Dominican and Franciscan orders, so the arrangement operated advantageously for the cause of religious instruction and the care of souls in those German dioceses.

#### IV. PROPHETIC WARNINGS AGAINST THE SECULARIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

The church having arrived at the summit of power, the conviction continually gained force on the minds of men, that the superfluity of earthly goods would work ruin to the church itself; that through this secularizing spirit she was becoming estranged from her true calling. The complaints of the Hohenstaufen emperors, and of an entire party which attached itself to them;\* the voices of the German national bards,† and of the prophets that rose up to oppose the corruption of the church, as well as of the sects that contended against her;

\* The Gottfried of Viterbo, mentioned on page 238, speaking of Constantine's donation to Silvester, says: Ego autem, ut de sensu meo loquar, utrum Deo magis placeat gloria et exaltatio ecclesiæ, quæ hoc tempore est, aut humilitatio, quæ primitus fuerat, confiteor me ignorare. *Videtur multis quidem primus ille status sanctior, iste felicior.* He does not venture to decide on the point, since Christ promised the church freedom from error. Cætera super his quæstionibus, majoribus nostris solvenda relinquimus. Pantheon, p. xvi., in Muratori, Script. rerum Italicar. f. 361.

† E. g. in Walter von der Vogelweide, the legend of the threefold woe, which the angels had announced at the donation made by Constantine to Silvester: "Once, Christianity was beautiful; a poison has now fallen on it; its honey has been turned to gall; great sorrow will come from this upon the world." Edition of Lachmann, p. 25.

all were agreed in attributing her degeneracy to the riches that had been lavished on her. A certain faculty of prophecy seems implanted in the spirit of humanity; the longing heart goes forth to meet beforehand great and new creations, which it needs in order to the attainment of its objects; undefined presentiments hasten to anticipate the mighty future. Especially does the kingdom of God, in the course of its development from beginning to end, form a connected whole, and it strives towards its completion according to sure and certain laws. The germ of the unknown future is already contained in the past. The spirit of the kingdom of God begets, therefore, in those who are filled with it, a prophetic consciousness, —presentiments in reference to the grand whole of the evolution, which are different from the prediction of individual events, not necessarily connected with that whole. Although the appearance of Christ, as the great turning-point in man's history, would above all be necessarily preceded by prophecy and anticipation, yet, to the still further evolution of the kingdom of God, even after it has left its first envelopment, and come forth to the open light, belongs also a prophetic element; as many an important epoch and turning-point still remains to be unfolded in its history, till it arrives at the ultimate goal. Out of the consciousness of the corruption of the church sprang the presentiment of a future regeneration, for which the way must be prepared by some violent process of purification. To longing hearts, a contemplation of the corruption of the secularized church served as a sort of foil, enabling them to picture forth, by the rule of contraries, the image of the better future. Accordingly, we may recognize in phenomena of this kind, belonging to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, foretokens—premonitions, of the Reformation; and perhaps, also, of epochs of development lying still more remote. Not the Christian spirit alone, however, but the antichristian also, has its divination. We see already budding forth, in antagonism with the false objectivity and externalization of the church, the tendency to a false inwardness and subjectivity; a tendency which aimed at, and predicted, the dissolution of everything positive in religion, and, consequently, the dissolution of Christianity itself; premonitions of a spiritual bent, which, after mining for centuries in the heart of European civilization, was destined finally

to burst through all the established boundaries of its social order.

As representatives of the first-described direction of the prophetic spirit, we may mention the abbess Hildegard and the abbot Joachim. The predictions of the latter, however, were afterwards taken up by the second of the above-mentioned directions, and interpreted in accordance with its own sense. We will now proceed to take a nearer view of these two important personages.

Hildegard, who was born in 1098, and died in 1197,\* founded, and presided as abbess over, the Rupert convent near Bingen. Her visions, which were held to be supernatural,—the revelations which she claimed herself to have received from Heaven,—her plain, frank, and moving exhortations, made her an object of great veneration. Especially after the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux,—while sojourning in Germany on the business of preaching the crusade,—and pope Eugene the Third, had both recognized the divinity of her mission, did she attain the highest summit of her reputation. Persons of all ranks applied to her for advice, for the disclosing of future events, for the decision of disputed questions, for her intercessions, and her spiritual consolations. Amongst those who consulted her were to be reckoned abbots and bishops, popes, kings, and emperors. If many complained of the obscurity of her sayings,† others might suppose they found a deeper wisdom in the darkness of the response. Parents longing to obtain children had recourse to the intercessions of Hildegard; and to such applications she replied: “This depends on the power and will of God, who alone knows to whom he grants children, and from whom he takes them away; for his judgment is not according to man’s liking, but according to his own wisdom. Because you have besought me, I will beseech God for you; but let him do what, according to his grace and mercy, he has determined to do.”‡

\* The collections on the history of their lives, in the *Actis Sanctorum*, 17th Sept.

† Thus we hear of an Abbot Berthold: *Licet consolationibus verborum vestrorum factus sum sæpe lætior, obscuritatibus tamen eorum eo quod non plene intellectui meo paterent, factus sum tristior.* Martene et Durand, *Collectio amplissima*, T. II. f. 1017.

‡ Martene et Durand, *Collectio ampl.* T. II. f. 1029. Ep. 11.

Many of her exhortations and responses betoken, on the whole, a Christian wisdom superior to the prejudices of her times. Pointing to the inward temper alone, as the important thing in Christian life, she declared herself opposed to all over-estimation of outward works, and all excessive asceticism. To an abbess she wrote, cautioning her against such delusion: "I have often observed that, when a man mortifies his body by extreme abstinence, a sort of disgust steals over him, and from this disgust he is more apt to plunge into vice than if he had allowed due nourishment to his body."\* In the name of God, she gave to another this response: "What I have given man to eat, I do not take from him; but food that excites disgust I know not, for vanity goes with it. Believe not that by immoderate abstinence any soul can fly to me; but avoiding all extremes, let the man devote himself to me, and I will receive him."† To another much respected nun of this period, Elizabeth of Schönau, who also supposed herself favoured with heavenly visions, she gave the following exhortation: "Let those who would do the work of God be ever mindful that they are earthen vessels—that they are men. Let them ever keep before their eyes what they now are, and what they shall be; and let them commit heavenly things to him who is in heaven, for they are themselves at a far distance from their home, and know not the things of heaven."‡ To an abbess, who begged an explanation of some anxiety by which she was troubled, she replied: "Thou shouldst hold fast to the *sacred Scriptures*, in which we come to the knowledge of God by faith. We should not tempt God, but reverentially adore him. Oftentimes, man impatiently desires from God a solution of some difficulty which it is not granted him to understand, and is thereby misled to forsake God's service. Give thyself no concern about thoughts rising up involuntarily in thy soul. Satan often shoots such arrows into man's heart, in order to create distrust of God. This should serve as an exercise for self-denial; everything depends on not giving way to such thoughts. Blessed is the man who by so doing *lives*,

\* Sæpe video, quando homo per nimietatem abstinentiæ corpus suum affligit, quod tædium in illo surgit, et tædio vitio se implicat, plus quam si illud juste pasceret. L. c. f. 1068.

† L. c. f. 1060.

‡ Hildegard. epistolæ, p. 115. Colon. 1566.

though constantly girt around, as it were, by the pains of death.”\* To an abbot, harassed by many inward conflicts, who applied to her for comfort and for her intercessions, she replied: “There is in thee a breath of God, to which God has communicated an endless life, and to which he has given the wings of reason; rise, therefore, with them, through faith and pious aspirations, to God. Know him as thy God who knew thee first, and from whom thy being proceeds; therefore, beseech him that, by the breath of his Spirit, he would teach thee what is good, and deliver thee from evil. Trust in him, that thou mayest not be ashamed to appear before him with all thy works; and pray to him, as a son does to a father, when punished by him because he has erred, that he would remember his own child, in thee.”† In the time of the schism between pope Alexander the Third and Victor the Fourth, a certain abbot applied, among others, to Hildegard, to inform him what he ought to do, so long as it remained doubtful which was to be considered the true pope?‡ She advised him to say in his heart to God, “Lord, thou, who knowest all things, in my superiors I will obey thee, so long as they oblige me to do nothing contrary to the Catholic faith.” He should place his hope in God alone, who would never forsake his church.§ To an abbess who applied to her for comfort, and for her intercessions, she wrote: “Abide in communion with *Christ*; seek all good *in him*; to him reveal thy works, and he will bestow on thee salvation; for without *him* salvation is sought in vain from man; for grace and salvation are attained, not through any man, but through God.” She boldly stood forth against the arbitrary will of an ambitious

\* *Beatus homo, qui ea nec facere vult, nec eis consentit, sed sicut cum passione mortis in eis vivit.* Martene et Durand, *Collectio ampl.* T. II. f. 1075.

† Martene et Durand, *Collectio ampl.* T. II. f. 1053.

‡ The abbot, speaking of the pernicious consequences of a schism of this sort, which every man would take advantage of as a pretext for disobedience, had said: *Quoniam ecclesia, ad quod caput suum respiciat, veraciter ignorat, quia quisque vagus inde exemplum sumens religionem bonæ conversationis abhorret, hi qui spiritu Dei aguntur, non minime sollicitantur, qui finis eorum in voluntate Dei esse debeat.* L. c. f. 1055.

§ *Tu ergo spe tua ad unum Deum tende, quia ipse ecclesiam suam non derelinquet.*

clergy. In the cemetery of her convent one was buried who, it was said, had been excommunicated; but those who performed the obsequies maintained that he had obtained absolution. The spiritual authorities of Mayence caused the body to be dug up, and laid the convent under an interdict because ecclesiastical burial had been granted to an excommunicated person. Hildegard thereupon issued a letter, addressed to the clergy of Mayence,\* in which she represented to them how grievously they had sinned by such an arbitrary proceeding. "All prelates were bound to avoid taking a step, except after the most careful examination of reasons, which would prevent *any* community, by their sentence, from singing God's praise or administering and receiving the sacraments. They should be very certain, that they were moved to such a step only by zeal for God's justice, and not by anger or revenge." She assured them that she had heard a divine voice saying: "Who created heaven?—God. Who opens heaven to the faithful?—God. Who is like unto him?—No man."†

The clergy, generally, she severely rebuked on account of their corrupt morals; their ambition and thirst for lucre; their unholy traffic with sacred things; their occupations, which were so utterly inconsistent with the spiritual calling,—such as bearing arms, singing ludicrous songs.‡ She reproaches them for neglecting, in their devotion to worldly pursuits, the peculiar duties of their calling,—the instruction of the people in God's law, offering the idle excuse that it costs too much labour.§ They rendered themselves chargeable, by this neglect and by their bad example, with the guilt of ruining the laity, who lived according to their lusts; before whom they ought rather to shine as pillars of light. She announced to the clergy a divine judgment, which would deprive them of the riches that served to corrupt them; a judgment from which the clergy was to come forth tried and refined. The then spreading sects of the Catharists and the

\* Martene et Durand, *Collectio ampl.* T. II, f. 1058.

† Hildegard, *epistolæ*, p. 121.

‡ L. c. p. 160, to the clergy in Cologne: *Interdum milites, interdum servi, interdum ludificantes cantores existitis; sed per fabulosa officia vestra muscas in æstate aliquando abigitis.*

§ *Nec subditos doctrinam a vobis querere permittitis, dicentes; omnia elaborare non possumus.*



Apostolici\* appeared to her the antetype of a party which would be used by the Almighty as an instrument of this judgment for the purification of the church.† “A troop led astray, and commissioned by Satan, shall come, with pale countenances and all appearance of sanctity; and they shall combine with the mightier princes of the world. In mean apparel shall they go; full of meekness and composure of mind shall they appear; by simulating the strictest abstinence and chastity shall they draw after them a numerous train of followers; and to the princes shall they say, concerning you, Why tolerate these people among you who pollute the whole earth with their sins? They live in drunkenness and revelling, and unless you drive them forth the whole church will go to destruction. These people shall be the rod which God will make use of to chastise you, and they shall continue to persecute you until you are purified from your sins. When this is done, then shall the princes discover the hypocritical character of these persecutors of the clergy, and fall upon them. Then shall the morning dawn of righteousness arise, and the clergy, purified by affliction, shine as the finest gold.”‡

The predictions of Hildegard were widely diffused, and much read; and they gave matter for reflection on the nature of that process of purification which awaited a corrupted church. New prophetic visions were called forth by them.

Far more graphically depicted did the image of the future present itself in the soul of the abbot Joachim, who, at first, presided over the monastery at Corace (Curatium) in Calabria, at length founded the monastery of Floris, and a peculiar congregation of monks, and died between the years 1201 and 1202. He was revered in his time as a prophet, and stood in high consideration with popes and princes.§ He was an enthusiastic friend of monasticism and of the con-

\* Of whom we shall speak in the fourth section.

† *Per quendam errantem populum, pejorem erranti populo, qui nunc est, super vos prævaricatores ruina cadet, qui ubique vos persequetur et qui opera vestra non celabit, sed ea denudabit.* L. c. p. 160.

‡ Hildegard. *epistolæ*, p. 169.

§ See the records and collections on the history of his life in the *Actis Sanctior.* 29th of May. Comp. Dr. Engelhardt's Essay, on the Abbot Joachim and the Everlasting Gospel, p. 32, in his *Kirchengeschichtlichen Abhandlungen*.

templative life, from which he looked for the regeneration of the secularized church. He opposed the mystical to the scholastico-dialectic theology. As the reigning corruption seemed to him to spring from secularization, and the fondness for dry and meagre conceptions of the understanding, so he expected from religious societies, who should renounce all earthly goods, and live only in pious contemplation, a new and more glorious epoch of the church in the latter days. We must transport ourselves back to the times in which he lived. It was near the close of the twelfth century ; the papacy had been seen to come forth victoriously out of the contest with the emperor Frederic the First ; but new and violent storms might still be expected to burst from the side of that powerful house. The Calabrian regarded Germany with detestation ; and he was inclined to look upon the imperial power of Germany as the one to be employed in executing judgment on a corrupted church ; but neither could he forgive it in the popes that they had taken refuge in France. Grief over the corruption of the church, longing desire for better times, profound Christian feeling, a meditative mind, and a glowing imagination, such are the peculiar characteristics of his spirit and of his writings. His ideas were presented for the most part in the form of comments and meditations on the New Testament ; but the language of the Bible furnished him only with such hints as might turn up for the matter which he laid into them by his allegorizing mode of interpretation ; although the types, which he supposed he found presented in the Scriptures, reacted in giving shape to his intuitions. As his writings and ideas found great acceptance, in this age, among those who were dissatisfied with the present, and who were longing after a different condition of the church ; and the Franciscans, who might easily fancy they discovered, even in that which is certainly genuine in Joachim's writings, a prophecy referring to their order, so a strong temptation arose to the forging of works under his name, or the interpolating those which really proceeded from him. The loose connection of the matter in his works, made it easy to insert passages from other hands ; and this character of the style renders a critical sifting of them difficult.\*

\* The three works referred to by himself, in the prologue to his Commentary on the Apocalypse, namely : *This Commentary*, the *Concordiæ*

Let us now consider, more in detail, what is expressed in these remarkable writings concerning the present and the future.

Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, and the Psalterium decem Chordarum, are certainly genuine. In reference, however, to the Commentary on Jeremiah and Isaiah, my own opinion would be confirmatory of the suspicions expressed by Engelhardt. These books are not cited in the list given by Joachim himself, although the Commentary on Jeremiah purports to have been written in the year 1197, and the Commentary on the Apocalypse, to which the above-mentioned prologue belongs, was composed in the year 1200. Moreover, in the preface to his Psalterium decem Chordarum, he mentions only those three works as belonging to one whole. The prediction of two new orders of monks, who should appear for the glorification of the church in the last times, and which were supposed to be fulfilled in the Dominican and Franciscan orders, certainly does not warrant us to entertain the suspicion, at once, that they were of later origin: for the contemplative life of monasticism was assuredly regarded by the abbot Joachim as the highest of all; and a renovation of that mode of life could not but appear to him as one of the essential marks of the glory of the last age of the church. But then again, the idea of a double order of monks presented itself to him of its own accord,—of an order, whose labours in the way of preaching was to bring about the last general conversion of the nations; an order which should represent the highest Johannean stage of the contemplative life. Thus, no doubt, it may be explained that, even without being a prophet, he might hit on the thought of sketching forth a picture of two such orders; since we find something like this in the writings which undoubtedly belong to him. But still, many descriptions of the Franciscans are too striking not to excite the suspicion that they have been foisted in by some Franciscan; as, for example, *Commentar. in Jerem.*, p. 81, the *prædicatores* and the *ordo minorum*; and the way in which the author expresses himself in this place, makes it certainly more probable that the title *minores*, already existing, led him to the explications which there occur, than that he had been led by those explications so to designate this order of contemplatives. Next occur, particularly in the *Commentary on Isaiah*, as they do not in Joachim's undoubtedly genuine works, certain prophecies, which seem to have arisen *post factum*. Page seventh contains the remarkable passage concerning Almaric of Bena, *Revelation ix. 2*, thus interpreted: *Sive Almericus sive aliquis alius in Liguria doctor magnus fuerit, qui detexerit profundum scientiæ sæcularis, cum regio illa adeo infecerit erroribus circumpositas regiones, ut de hujusmodi locustis et lamiis ipsa mater ecclesia tabescat.* Page 28, col. 2, the predictions concerning the power of the Mongols; how the Tartars would turn their arms against the Mohammedans. To be sure, the spurious character of such single passages is no evidence of the spuriousness of the entire work, in which moreover, the current ideas of Joachim may easily be discerned: and in the *Commentary on Jeremiah* we also find many single passages which do not favour the hypothesis

In his commentary on the prophet Jeremiah, Joachim complains of the exactions of the Roman church: "The whole world is polluted with this evil. There is no city nor village where the church does not push her benefices, collect her revenues. Everywhere she will have prebends, endless incomes. O God! how long dost thou delay to avenge the blood of the innocent, which cries to thee from beneath the altar of the Capitol?"\* He calls the church of Rome the house of the courtesan, where all practise simony, all are stained and polluted; where the door is thrown open to every one who knocks. He speaks against the legates, who travel about the provinces, impudently preach, acquire benefices and prebends, snatch to themselves the dignity of the prelates. He complains of the deification of the Roman church. "Some have so exalted the church in Rome," says he, "that a man was held up as a heretic who did not visit the threshold of Peter. Their guilty mistake lay in this, that they bid men visit the holy material temple, when the truth is, that in every place every Christian is a temple of God, if he leads a good life.† He speaks against indulgences dispensed from Rome: "Many place so much confidence in the absolution of the church, as never once to think that they need to leave off sinning! but sink deeper and deeper in all manner of wickedness." He is full of zeal against the proud and fleshly living cardinals and

of its having been composed at some later period. Would a Franciscan, instead of referring all to the two mendicant orders, have so expressed himself as on page 85: *In tertio vero statu retorquendum est totum ad Cistercienses et alios futuros religiosos, qui post antichristi ruinam multiplicandi sunt?* Page 151, the successor of Celestin is compared with Herod the Great, and a persecution of the *spiritualis intelligentia*, proceeding from him, is predicted: *Designat Herodes summum pontificem post Cœlestinum futurum, quicumque sit ille.* It is easy to see how Joachim, writing near the end of the reign of Celestin, might have been led by his typical exposition, flights of imagination, and his tone of character, to predict such things of Celestin's successor; but it is difficult to believe that a man belonging to one of the two monkish orders, afterwards Innocent the Third, would be so designated.

\* A play on words: *O Deus, quousque non vindicas sanguinem innocentum, sub altari clamantium Romani Capituli, immo Capitoli?*

† *Quia invitabant ad templum sanctum materiale arguuntur, quia in loco omni quilibet christianus templum Dei est, dummodo bonas faciat vias suas.*

prelates.\* He predicts a divine judgment on the Roman curia, because litigious processes and exactions were worse in that court than in all other judicatories.† He announces that Christ is about to grasp the scourge, and drive sellers and buyers out of the temple. He does not stop with accusations against the church of Rome, but attacks also the prevailing corruption in all other parts of the church. "The church of Peter," says he, "the church of Christ, which was once full, is now empty: for, although she now seems full of people, yet they are not her people, but strangers. They are not her sons, the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, but the sons of Babylon. What profits the name of Christ, where the power is wanting? The church is, as it were, widowed: there are but few or no bishops, who, to save their flocks, expose themselves a prey to the wolves. Every man seeks his own, and not the things of Jesus Christ."‡ "Where," says he,§ "is there more contention, more fraud, more vice and ambition, than among the clergy of our Lord? Therefore must judgment begin from the house of the Lord, and the fire go forth from his sanctuary, to consume it, in order that the others may perceive what will be done with them when he spares not even his sinning children." Of the Romish church, to which he frequently applies the name Babylon, he says, "She should not plume herself upon her faith, when she denies the Lord by her works."|| He is fond of marking the course of history; particularly the history of the papacy. He describes pope Leo the Ninth as the representative of a reforming tendency in the church.¶ Pope Paschalis the Second he represents as the traitor of the church, who had reduced her to servitude.\*\* He accuses the popes of conniving at wickedness in order to gain temporal advantages

\* *Prælatos et cardinales superbe carnaliterque viventes.* Comment. in Jerem. p. 262.

† *Transcendit papale prætorium cunctas curias in calumniosis litibus et quæstibus extorquendis.* Comment. in Esaiam, p. 39.

‡ *De concordia novi et veteris testamenti,* p. 54; therefore in a writing undoubtedly genuine.

§ *L. c. p. 53.*

|| *In Jerem. p. 65.*

¶ *Ut ambularent in novitate spiritus in carne viventes.*

\*\* See above, p. 2, f. Compare also the commentary on the apocalypse, p. 7: *In tempore ecclesiæ quinto et maxime a diebus Henrici primi imperatoris Alamannorum mundani principes, qui Christiani di-*

from princes, and of having made themselves slaves to princes because they wished to rule by secular power. "After the popes began to contend with worldly princes, and to be intent on reigning over them by worldly pride, they have been obliged ever since the time of Pope Paschalis to fall beneath them. Their successors down to the present time have sacrificed the liberties of the church to the German monarchs; and, for the sake of temporal things, have tolerated many an offence in the church of God. Because they perceived that the temporal things after which they lusted belonged to the Roman empire, they were willing rather to do homage for a while to secular princes, than to go against the stream." \* "Although," says he,† "the secular princes have wrested many things by violence from the church, as, for example, the Kingdom of the Sicilies; and, although they hinder the freedom of the church, yet even the popes themselves have wrested many things from the princes, which they never should have longed after nor taken. And as every man seeks his own, force is met by force; the church attacks the state, the greedy prelates receive not the word of Christ, 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's;' thus the *old bottles will burst*, and the pope will not only long after temporal things, as belonging to him, but also after spiritual things which do not belong to him, (the sense is, he will arrogate to himself all spiritual authority, even that which does not belong to him). Thus will it come to pass, that he will seat himself in the temple of God, and, as a god, exalt himself above all that is called God, that is, above the authority of all prelates." ‡ In the commentary on Isaiah, he remarks: "When the chair of Peter drew the temporal sword in compliance with a forbidden ambition, and his sons, like cattle for the slaughter, exposed themselves to doubtful chances, he considered not what the Scriptures say, 'He that takes the

cuntur, qui primo videbantur venerari clerum, deterius præ gentibus quæsierunt libertatem ecclesiæ, et quantum ad eos pertinet, abstulisse noscuntur. It is noticeable that Henry the Fifth is referred to as primus; and so he is always designated in the commentary on Jeremiah; as Henry the Sixth is there called secundus.

\* In Jeremiah, p. 330.

† Ibid. p. 310.

‡ Non tantum sua Romanus præses exiget quasi temporalia (it should doubtless read: temporalia quasi sua), sed etiam spiritualia quæ non sua. L. c. p. 310.

sword shall perish by the sword.\* It is the incredulity of human weakness," says he,† "which leads the popes to place more confidence in men than in God; and hence it happens, by a just judgment, that destruction comes from the very quarter where they looked for help. Surely, when we turn our eye to the root of this evil, it must be plain to us that the church, founded upon the lowly Christ, ought to keep far from pride; and she has reason to fear, that if she strives after earthly riches, these will finally be driven away like chaff before the wind. The church ought, in these times, when she is oppressed by those of her own household, to place her confidence not in worldly goods, but in the power of God. If believing princes have offered some gifts to the poor Christ, still, the spiritual order, waxen fat with abundance, must not give themselves up to pride; but rather distribute their superfluous wealth to the poor, and not to the giants who have helped to build the tower of Babel (the high prelates, by whom the secularization of the church is promoted). Gold was brought to Christ, that he might have the means of fleeing into Egypt; myrrh was offered him, as if in allusion to his death; incense that he might praise God, not that he might rise up against Herod, or fall as a burden upon Pharaoh; not that he might give himself up to sensual delights, or reward benefits received with ingratitude. The vicerents of Christ, in these latter times, care nothing for the incense, they seek only the gold; in order that, with great Babylon, they may mingle the golden goblets, and pollute their followers with their own uncleanness." "Because the cardinals, priests, and different orders of the clergy, who at present are very seldom followers of the lowly Christ, use the goods of the churches in the service of their lusts; therefore the princes of the world, who behold the disgrace of the sanctuary, stretch out their hands to the property of the church, believing that by so doing they render a service to the Most High."‡ "The church," says he,§ "can and could retire into solitude, lead a spiritual life, abide in communion with

\* Ubi pro terrenis ambitionibus sibi prohibitis temporalem gladium exemit, et filios suos eventibus dubiis, velut oves occisionis exponit, non revolvens animo quod scriptura præloquitur, p. 7.

† In Jerem. p. 370.

‡ In Esaiam, p. 28.

§ In Jerem. p. 56.

Christ, her bridegroom; and through her love to him she would become mistress of the world, and perhaps no longer be subject to pay quit-rent. But alas! in loving the friendship of secular princes, and grasping without shame after earthly incomes, she is humiliated in the same proportion as she lowered herself down to such familiarity and concupiscence." As Joachim believed the popes were paving the way for the overthrow of their own power by seeking to hold it up by worldly props, instead of confiding solely on the power of God, so he looked upon it as one evidence of the weakness they had brought upon themselves, that they must in the twelfth century so often seek a refuge in France. He warns them "to see to it, lest that French power might prove to them a broken reed."

Joachim was full of zeal for the essential matter of an inward, living Christianity; and hence he decried that confidence in externals which tended to render men secure in their sins, and to draw them away from true penitence. "Many of the laity," says he,\* "expect to be saved by the offerings of the priests and the prayers of the regular clergy, even while they give themselves up to sin. But in vain look they to such gods for help; their incense is an abomination to God."† "That which is represented outwardly in the sacraments," says he, "can be of no saving benefit whatever to a man if in his daily actions he does not strive to live conformably to what is thus outwardly represented. "For why wast thou baptized unto Christ if thou wilt not be pure? Why art thou buried in baptism if thou wilt continue to live in sin? Why dost thou partake of the body of Christ, that was offered for thee, if thou art not willing to die for Christ if it be necessary?‡ The sacraments, then, do nothing for those that abuse them; they benefit those only who so live as the sacraments signify."§

\* L. c. p. 104.

† Notandum est, quod laici quidam putant se sanari victimis sacerdotum et orationibus regularium, cum ipsi mala committant. Sed frustra tales dii eos adjuvant, nam incensum abominatio est mihi, holocaustomata nihilominus reprobata esse demonstrant.

‡ In Apocalypsis. p. 91.

§ Licet hæc omnia in sacramento fidelibus data sint, non potest tamen tenere illa, nisi id explere studeat moribus, quod sacramenti similitudo docet esse tenendum. Non igitur sacramenta conferunt aliquid abutentibus eis, sed his, qui ita vivunt, quo modo sacramenta significant.



Against sanctimonious monks he says,\* “They pass current for living men with those who are carnal and carnally minded, those who look merely on the outside, the visible appearance, and cannot see the idols within. Thus, they allow themselves to be deceived, praise and extol these miserable creatures, in whom there is nothing to praise, and hope for the forgiveness of their sins through the merits of those whose souls at the end of the present life sink to perdition.” Concerning fleshly representations of the divine Being, he says: “A God like this is not the God of believers, but of unbelievers, an idolatrous image of the human mind and not God.”† The jealousies subsisting between the different ranks in the church and the different orders of monks seemed to him most directly at variance with that pattern of the apostolic church, which was constantly present to his mind. “In those times,” says he, “there were manifold forms of life corresponding to different gradations of the development of the Christian life; but all were united together in the organism of the body of Christ, as harmonizing parts of one whole.”‡

Joachim agreed with Hildegard in announcing a terrible judgment that was coming upon the corrupted church, from which, however, she was to emerge purified and refined. It was also a characteristic point in the prophetic picture which floated before his imagination, that the secular power was to combine with the heretical sects in combating the church. As in Italy and Sicily, the name “Patarenes”§ was a popular and current name applied to sects, so the Patarenes, according to him, were to be the instrument for the execution of the divine judgment,—forerunners of the antichrist, from whom the latter himself was to proceed;—a king, and probably, in

\* L. c. p. 78.

† Deus, qui talis est, non est Deus fidelium, sed infidelium, idolum animarum et non Deus. P. 101, in the *Tractatus de concordia veteris et novi testamenti*.

‡ Quam vero longe sit omnis moderna religio a forma ecclesiæ primitivæ, eo ipso intelligi potest, quod illa apostolos et evangelistas, doctores et virgines, et zelantes vitam continentem et conjugatos veluti unus cortex mali Punici divisim tamen cellulis mansionum conjungebat in unum et conjunctis membrorum speciebus efficiebat ex omnibus unum corpus. Nunc autem alibi corpus et membra, singula pro seipsis, non pro aliis sunt sollicita. L. c. p. 71.

§ See above, p. 136, and the passages there cited.

conjunction with him, a false pope also. A pope, springing up from among the Patarnes, and armed with a seeming power of working miracles, would league himself with the antichrist of the secular power in the attack on the church, and stir up the latter against the faithful, as Simon Magus is said to have incited Nero to the persecution of the Christians.\* He was inclined to represent the antichrist as an incarnation of Satan, through whom the great enemy of all good would seek to accomplish against the church what he had hitherto attempted in vain. All the previous machinations of Satan against the church were but a preparation for this final attack, in which all preceding wickedness was to be concentrated; in which Satan, foreseeing the last judgment near at hand, would expend his rage in a last desperate effort.†

The house of Hohenstaufen hold a prominent place in his description of the judgment that was to come upon the secularized church. In the details, we meet with a great deal which is vague and self-contradictory; moreover, it admits of a question whether his predictions at this point may not have been interpolated, so as to agree with the issue of events.‡ When, in the year 1197,§ at the particular invitation of the emperor Henry the Sixth, he wrote his commentary on the prophet Jeremiah, he expresses himself in one place|| as uncertain whether or not another emperor would yet intervene between him and his heirs.¶ Such an intervening emperor did in fact come in, after the death of Henry, in the same year. He

\* In Jerem. p. 123. The secta falsorum christianorum et hæreticorum, quorum caput erit antichristus, et forsitan pseudopapa erit adjutus et fultus antichristo reipublicæ; and p. 143, we find, as the seventh and last persecutor of the church, the antichristus, rex Patarnorum.

† Et sciendum, quod in primis temporibus præliatus est diabolus in membris suis, in extremis vero temporibus præliabitur in illo, qui erit caput et primus omnium reprobos, in quo et habitabit specialius ac si in vase proprio per seipsum, ut malum, quod princeps dæmonum nequivit explere, ipse quasi magnus et potens expleat in furore fortitudinis suæ. In the concordia 130, 2.

‡ In the commentary on Isaiah, p. 4, is cited a vaticinium Silvestri de Frederico Secundo, et ejus posteris: Erit in insidiis sponsæ agni, quam præsules dilaniant et absorbent.

§ Commentar. in Jerem. p. 33.

|| L. c. p. 86. He says to him: Et jugum patris tui vix pontifices potuerunt portare et minimus digitus tuus lumbis est grossior patris tui.

¶ Utrum inter Henricum hunc et hæredem alius surgat, illi videbunt, qui supererunt. L. c. p. 86.

foretold, though without intimating that the event was so near at hand, that Frederic the Second would remain under the tutelage of his mother Constantia, and that —if the Roman see did not care to preserve for him the empire which another\* would make himself master of—he would stand forth as ruler and pour out upon the church a mortal poison.† Sometimes the year 1200, sometimes 1260, is mentioned as one which would constitute an epoch in history.

Joachim, as we have said, was an opponent of the prevailing dialectic tendency in theology. Hence the latter days of the church, when it should have come forth glorified out of the refining process, appeared to him as a time of all-satisfying contemplation, taking the place of that learning which dwells on the letter and finite conceptions of the understanding, when the inspiration of love, that meditation on divine things which can solve all problems, would follow an imperfect, fragmentary, conceptual knowledge. Connected with this is a division of the different periods of revelation and of history, which from this time onward recurs repeatedly under various phases,—a division conformable to the doctrine of the trinity. Although, by virtue of their essential unity, all the three persons ever work together, and somewhat belonging properly to each person is to be found in every period, yet, at the same time, in relation to the distinction of persons, the predominant activity of some one amongst the three is to be distinguished according to the measure of three principal periods. The times of the Old Testament belong especially to God the Father; in it, God revealed himself as the Almighty, by signs and wonders; next, followed the times of the New Testament, in which God, as the Word, revealed himself in his wisdom, where the striving after a comprehensible knowledge of mysteries predominates; the last times

\* Otho the Fourth.

† L. c. p. 299. Sub nomine viduæ tangit consortem tuam Constantiam, cujus pupillus filius erit. Puto quoque, si Romana sedes post te de manu calumniatoris posita accessoris regnum liberare neglexerit, versa vice pupillus mutatus in regulum super eam mortalia venena diffundet. He says that, under him, the fastigium imperiale would decline, protendetur vita ejus, quasi vita regis in 60 annis. He announces, in the year 1197, the persecution proceeding from the Hohenstaufen house against the Romish church, in 64 annos deteriores prioribus. L. c. p. 331.

belong to the Holy Spirit, when the fire of love in contemplation will predominate.\* As the letter of the Old Testament answers to God the Father, the letter of the New Testament more especially to the Son, so the spiritual understanding, which proceeds from both, answers to the Holy Spirit.† As all things were created by the Father through the Son; so in the Holy Spirit, as love, all were to find their completion.‡ To the working of the Father,—power, fear, faith, more especially correspond; to the working of the Son,—humility, truth, and wisdom; to the working of the Holy Spirit,—love, joy, and freedom.§ In connection with this must be considered the way in which he contemplates the three apostles—Peter, Paul, and John—as representatives of the three periods in the process of the development of the church. John represents the contemplative bent, and as he laboured where Peter and Paul had already laid the foundation, and survived the other apostles, so the Johannean contemplative period would be the last times of the church, corresponding to the age of the Holy Spirit. As the Father revealed himself in the Old Testament, and the Son, after the completion of the Old, introduced the New; so this relation corresponds to that of Paul to Peter; since Paul did not labour on the foundation which Peter had laid, but opened for himself an independent field of action; and as then the completion was given to the

\* The words in John v. 17, according to the Vulgate: “*Pater meus usque modo operatur, et ego operor*,” he explains as follows: “Till now the Father has worked; from henceforth I work.” When accused of Tritheism on this account, he retaliated by accusing his opponents of Sabellianism: *Non attendentes, quod sicut vere in personis proprietates est et in essentia unitas, ita quædam sint, quæ propter proprietatem personarum proprie adscribantur patri, quædam, quæ proprie adscribantur filio, quædam, quæ proprie spiritui sancto, et quæ propter unitatem essentiae ipsamet communiter referantur ad omnes. Introduct. in Apocalyps. p. 13.*

† *Ut littera testamenti prioris proprietate quadam similitudinis videatur pertinere ad patrem, littera testamenti novi pertinere ad filium, ita spiritalis intelligentia, quæ procedit ex utraque, ad spiritum sanctum. L. c. p. 5.*

‡ *Quoniam sicut a patre omnia sunt et per filium omnia, ita et in spiritu sancto, qui est caritas Dei, consummanda sunt universa. In Apocalyps. p. 84.*

§ *Nonnulla specialius attribuantur patri, sicuti potentia, timor et fides, nonnulla filio, ut humilitas, veritas et sapientia, nonnulla spiritui sancto, ut caritas, gaudium et libertas. L. c. p. 48.*

whole by John, so in the last Johnnean period, that which the Son began will be carried to its completion by the Holy Spirit.\* Then will the promise of the Lord be fulfilled; that he had yet many things to say which his disciples could not then bear; that this Spirit should guide into all truth. In the words spoken by Christ to John (John xxi. 23), "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" he finds an intimation of the fact that the Johannean period would be the last.† He says of John, "What he himself had drunk out of the heart of Christ, that he has given the chosen to drink—the living water, which he had drunk from the fountain of life; for the living water is the Holy Scriptures, in their spiritual sense, which was not written with ink, pen, and paper, but by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the book of man's heart."‡ John is the representative of the contemplative, as Peter, of the practical tendency; the latter prefigures the clerical, the former the monastic, order. When Peter (John xxi. 21) supposes that John also was to be a martyr, by this is signified the jealousy of the practical class towards the contemplative: they reproach the latter with leading so easy and quiet a life, and taking no share in their toils: they do not consider that it costs quite as much self-denial to human nature, patiently to wait the revelation of God, and to give one's self up entirely to the contemplation of divine things, as to pursue bodily labour; to sit in one spot, as to be driven about in a multiplicity of employments. As after the martyrdom of Peter, John alone remained, so when the order of the clergy shall have perished in martyrdom, following Christ, in the last conflict with anti-christ, the order of the contemplative, genuine monks shall alone remain, and the entire succession of St. Peter pass over into that.§ The order of genuine contemplatives and spirituales,

\* Et illud diligenter observa, quod quando inter Petrum et Joannem interponitur Paulus, tunc Petrus designat personam patris, Paulus filii, Joannes spiritus sancti, et quia Paulus non superædificavit a principio in his, quæ Petrus fundavit, fundavit autem ipse per se (et superædificavit Joannes), unigenitum Dei patris in hoc ipso designat, qui consummato veteri testamento, quod specialius pertinebat ad patrem, inchoavit testamentum novum, quod specialius pertinet ad seipsum, superveniet autem spiritus sanctus, consummaturus, quæ inchoata sunt et fundata a filio.

† Significat electos tertii status. In Apocalyps. p. 84.

‡ In Apocalyps. p. 3.

§ Relinquatur pars illa electorum, quæ designata est in Joanne, ad

prefigured by Jesus himself, might perhaps—he supposes, in his Commentary on the Apocalypse—be already existing in the germ; but as yet it could not be observed, *because the beginnings of a new creation are ever wont to be obscure and contemptible*.\* The abbot Joachim was filled with that same idea,—an idea called forth by the antagonism to the secularization of the church,—which had seized many serious minds of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and which gave birth to the first societies of the Waldenses, as well as of the Franciscans. Accordingly, he must be a prophet for all appearances of a kindred character.

Each of the three great apostles had his peculiar gift of grace, conformable to the peculiar position which he took in the process of the development of the church. And, as this process was thereby prefigured, so each period in the history of the church has its peculiar gift of grace, belonging to this peculiar position. We should not expect to find everything, therefore, in every age. Peter represents the power of faith which works miracles; Paul, knowledge; and John, contemplation.†

In these last times was to be concentrated every divine element from the earlier periods. The planting and sowing of many years would be collected together at one point,—a period, though short in compass, yet greatest in intrinsic importance in reference to the fulness of grace there accumulated.‡ In the

quam oportet transire totam Petri successionem, deficiente parte illa laboriosa, quæ designata est in Petro, data ubique tranquillitate amatoribus Christi. In tempore nempe illo erit Dominus unus et nomen ejus unum. L. c. p. 77.

\* Qui videlicet ordo præ multis aliis, qui præcesserunt eum, amabilis et præclarus infra limitem quidem secundi status initiandus est, si tamen usque adhuc non est in aliquibus initiandus, quod tamen mihi adhuc non constat, *quia initia semper obscura et contemptibilia sunt*. In Apocalyps. p. 83, c. 2.

† Etsi Petro, apostolorum primo, data est prærogativa fidei ad faciendâ signa in typo eorum, qui dati sunt in fundamentis ecclesiæ, non ideo tamen parvi pendenda est clavis scientiæ, quæ data est Paulo, apostolorum novissimo, haud dubium quin in typo eorum, qui dandi erant in fine ad superædificandam ecclesiam. Novit nempe ille, qui pro temporum varietate dona distribuenda partitur, quid illis atque illis expediat, ita ut pro tempore existimandum sit, quid cui præferatur, et illud pro tempore magis eorum quod utile et non quod sublimius judicandum. L. c. p. 88.

‡ Etsi spatium illius temporis breve erit, gratiarum tamen copiosius

first period, the fathers laid themselves out in announcing God's great work of the creation; in the second, it was the effort of the Son to lay the foundation of hidden wisdom. When man, by means of the two Testaments, had now come to know how God had finished all things in wisdom, what still remains (for the third age) except to praise God, whose works are so great. The Father comes, as it were, when from the *things that are made* we come to the knowledge of the *Maker*, when in the contemplation of his almighty power we are filled with reverence; the Son comes to us, when we explore into the depths of doctrine in the discourses of him who is the Father's wisdom. The Holy Ghost comes and reposes in our hearts, when we taste the sweetness of his love, so that we break forth into songs of praise to God rather than keep silence.\* Then will ensue the time of an Easter jubilee, in which all mysteries will be laid open, the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord, and it will be scarcely possible any longer to find a man who will dare deny that Christ is the Son of God.† The Spirit will stand forth free from the veil of the letter. It is the gospel of the Spirit, the everlasting gospel; for the gospel of the letter is but temporary.‡

It was this doctrine of the abbot Joachim which was afterwards apprehended and applied in so many different ways; which in fact, at a later period, came to be so interpreted, by a one-sided rationalistico-pantheistic party, as to make Christianity itself, which was considered but a transient form of religious development, cease, and give place to a higher position, a purely inward religion of the Spirit, consisting of some intuition of God that no longer needed an intermediate organ. Joachim was very far from holding Christianity in itself to be a transient form of the manifestation of religion. The knowledge, transcending all doubt, of Jesus as the Son of God, he considered indeed, as we have seen, as something distinguishing those last times of the Holy Spirit; he taught

cæteris, ut multorum annorum segetes congregentur in uno. In Apocalyp. p. 84.

\* Spiritus sanctus ad corda nostra venire et requiescere dicitur, cum dulcedo amoris ejus quam suavis sit degustamus, ita ut psallere magis libeat, quam a Dei laude tacere. L. c. p. 85. † L. c. p. 9.

‡ Evangelium æternum, quod est in spiritu, quoniam utique evangelium, quod est in litera, temporale est, non æternum. In Apoc. p. 95.

expressly\* that two Testaments only were to be received ; for the last revelation of the Holy Spirit was in fact to serve no other purpose than to make men conscious of the hidden spiritual meaning of both Testaments, and to let the spirit unfold itself out of the covering of the letter. Yet at the same time we must admit that the ideal, pantheistic interpretation above mentioned, found a point to fix upon in several of Joachim's expressions ; for instance, when he described the humility of self-debasement in the form of a servant as the peculiarity of the Son, the abiding in his spiritual exaltation, the purely spiritual revelation, as the peculiarity of the Holy Spirit, and hence assigned the advanced position of perfect freedom to the agency of the Holy Spirit ;† when he represented that position as a subordinate one, to which the divine must be brought nigh, by the revelation of God to sense in the incarnation of the Son, and by the instrumentalities corresponding thereto ; and on the other hand, that of the *spirituales*, who needed no such sensible medium, as the highest. " Say not, I have no teacher to explain to me in detail what I read. Where the Spirit is the teacher, a little spark increases to an immeasurable flame ; and because the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us, and he who by reason of the simplicity of his essence was invisible, dignified man's nature by appearing visibly in it, so he would be preached by visible men under the veil of the Word, that they who were unable by contemplation to penetrate into the mysteries of the divine essence, might through visible emblems soar upward to the exalted. But with spiritual men it is not so : but the purer their hearts are, the more do they by God's invisible operations, which are nearer to them, stretch the vision of their spiritual eyes to the Creator of all."‡ But such language merely expresses,

\* Hæc est causa, pro qua non tria testamenta, sed duo esse scribuntur, quorum concordia manet integra. L. c. p. 13.

† His words: Et quia aquæ natura gravis est et humilia petit, ignis pro levitate sua ad superiora recurrit, quid est, quod frequentius filius assimilatur aquæ, spiritus vero sanctus crebrius igni, nisi quia, quod non fecit spiritus sanctus, filius semetipsum exinanivit, formam servi accipiens, spiritus autem sanctus, de quo dicitur: ubi spiritus, ibi libertas, nequaquam eo modo, quo filius humiliatus est, sed in majestate gloriæ suæ, non assumpta carne permansit. In Apocalyps. p. 55.

‡ Qui erat invisibilis pro suæ simplicitate naturæ, per humanæ assumptionem substantiæ visibilis fieri dignatus est, voluit per visibiles



though in an original and forcible manner, the chosen position of mysticism, which gives special prominence to the work of the Holy Spirit in men's hearts; and such passages can by no means furnish any foundation for the charge, that he would speak disparagingly of historical Christianity. Yet we must allow that at the bottom of the whole mode of intuition set forth in his works, lies the thought, that the entire revelation of the Old and New Testaments contains, indeed, immutable truth, and that Christianity is in itself a complete and immutable thing; but yet, at the same time, this does not hold good of the different forms of its manifestation. The overthrow of the particular ecclesiastical form then existing, and a new, more complete development of Christianity in the consciousness of mankind, in which the inner revelation of the Holy Spirit will take the place of outward authority, is predicted by him. This is in fact already implied in what he says, in his own way, concerning the transition of the Petrine position into that of John, the dissolution of the clerical governance of the church and its rehabilitation in the community of the contemplative life. Doubtless he supposes, as the peculiarity of those last times, a direct and unmediated reference of the religious consciousness of all men, to God manifested in Christ, so that there would be no more need of an order of teachers.\* Then the prophecy of Jeremiah, that God himself would be the teacher of men, and would write his law in the hearts of all, would meet with its fulfilment; but as all earthly greatness must come to shame, when the sublimity of things heavenly revealed itself, so it was only by humbling himself that man could become capable of beholding such divine glory.†

homines vocis mysteria personari, ut hi qui arcana divinitatis penetrare contemplando non poterant, visibilibus ad sublimia raperentur exemplis. Non sic autem spirituales, non sic, sed quo illorum corda mundiora sunt, eo per invisibilia Dei opera, quæ sibi viciniora sunt, in ipsum, qui creator est omnium, spiritualium oculorum aciem intellectualiter figunt. In Apocalyps. p. 49.

\* Quasi per alios pascuntur oves, cum ad docendas subditorum ecclesias pastores in populis eliguntur, cum autem veritatem evangelicam clarificat per spiritum suum ad complendam prophetiam Jerem. xxxi. 33, 34; quasi jam non per alios Dominus, sed ipse per semetipsum requireret oves suas, sicut visitat pastor gregem suum in die, quando fuerit in medio ovium suarum dissipatarum.

† Et quia mirabilis est Deus in sanctis suis et longe mirabiliior in

Especially deserving of notice are the following words in the book written by abbot Joachim, on "The Harmony between the Old and New Testaments," (*Concordiæ Veteris ac Novi Testamenti*;) in which, speaking of the relation of changeable forms to the unchangeable essence in the revelation of divine things, he thus expresses himself:\* "The Holy Spirit is the fire which consumes all this. Why? Because there is nothing durable on earth; for so long as we see through a glass darkly, it is necessary for us to cling to those symbols, and so long are we unable to come to the knowledge of that truth which is represented in symbols; but when the Spirit of truth shall come and teach us all truth, what further need shall we then have of symbols?"† For as with the communion of the body of Christ the partaking of the paschal lamb was done away, so when the Holy Ghost shall reveal himself in his glory, the observation of symbols will cease; men will no longer follow figures, but the truth,—which is the simplest, and which is symbolized by fire,—as the Lord says, "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. Dust and water, such is the historical letter of the two Testaments,—which letter was given by the Holy Spirit for the purpose of pointing thereby to something else, rather than for the sake of the literal historical sense itself; that is, that thereby the spiritual understanding, which is the divine fire, by virtue of which the spiritual man judges all men and is judged by none, might be presented to us; for neither the partaking of bread and meat, nor the drinking of wine and water, nor the anointing with oil, is anything eternal, but that is eternal which is signified by these acts. If, then, the things themselves and their use are perishable, but that which is represented by them, the thing which endures for evermore; then with good right is the former consumed by the fire, while the fire itself lives alone, without depending on anything sensible in the hearts of the faithful, and abides for ever. And although there are many visible things which will eternally remain, as

*majestate sua, necesse est, ut semetipsum deiciat, qui videre tantam gloriam existimatur dignus, quia nimirum terrena altitudo confunditur, cum celsitudo cœlestium aperitur. In Apocalyps. p. 45.*

\* *L. c. p. 103.*

† *Quid nobis ulterius de figuris?*

VOL. VII.

Y

they are revealed to us in the letter of the two Testaments, yet they will not remain for ever in the same form, but rather in the form appointed for the future. For, amongst the rest, that which according to the Catholic faith shall remain for ever, the body of Christ,—which shall ever remain as it is taken up into unity with his person,—is to us especially an object of veneration. And yet our Lord himself declared the spirit maketh alive, the flesh profiteth nothing. Hence the apostle Paul also says, the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive. But if, in reference to the body of Christ himself, the letter is consumed by the spirit, how much more will this be the case with other things. Far be it from us, then, to say that the things themselves will be consumed as to their whole essence; but we say that they themselves, that is, their symbols, must pass over to represent something spiritual, in order that we may elevate ourselves, through the scripture of visible things, as through a glass, to the intuition of invisible things.”

## V.—HISTORY OF MONASTICISM.

The reaction of this prophetic spirit against the secularization of the church proceeded from monasticism, as did many an appearance of the same kind down to the time of Luther; nor was this an accidental thing, but connected with the essential character of monasticism itself; for we may regard it generally as a reaction, though one-sided, of the Christian spirit, against the secularization of the church and of the Christian life. It is true, monasticism was itself seized and borne along by the current of secularization; but even then, it ever gave birth to new reactions of reform against the encroaching tide of corruption. This form of the manifestation of Christian life and of Christian society belongs among the most significant and the most influential facts of these periods, in which the very good and the very bad are found so often meeting together.

Monasticism stood forth against the wild life of the knights, and the corruption of a degenerate clergy; and many were impelled to fly for refuge from the latter to the former. The Hildebrandian epoch of reform, near the close of the eleventh century, was accompanied with the outpouring of a spirit of

compunction and repentance on the Western nations. It was the same spirit which, in different directions, promoted the crusades, monasticism, and the spread of sects that contended against the hierarchy. By the political storms which broke up the interior organization of the nations, by the ruinous contests of this age between church and state, many were impelled to seek in the monasteries a quiet retreat for the cultivation of the Christian life. Thus it happened in Germany, amidst the ferocious contests between the party of Henry the Fourth and that of Gregory the Seventh. An extraordinary multitude of men of the first rank retired from the world; and the three monasteries, in which the greater number congregated, St. Blasien in the Black Forest, Hirsau, and the convent of St. Salvator in Schaffhausen, had not room enough to contain them all, so that it was necessary to make great additions to the old structures. Men of the first rank were here to be seen among the monks, selecting from preference and engaging with delight in the most menial employments, and serving as cooks, bakers, or shepherds.\* The impulse to community—the characteristic of energetic, creative times, belongs among the peculiar features of this time, and such communities easily formed themselves around any man that showed an enthusiasm for religion, that spoke and acted in the power of faith, and in love; and then took the form of monasticism.

But the causes differed widely in their nature which led men to choose this mode of life; and for this very reason the directions of life in monasticism would also be different. Oftentimes the deep piety of mothers, patterns of Christian virtue in the family circle, stood out in striking contrast with the mere worldly pursuits of their husbands in the knightly order, or in the life at court. When such mothers looked forward to the birth of their first child, or when they had much to suffer, and great peril was before them, they would vow before the altar to devote the child, in case it should be

\* Berthold. Constant. Chronicon, at the year 1083, in *Monumenta res Alemannorum illustrantia*, T. II. p. 120. *Quanto nobiliores erant in sæculo, tanto se contentibilioribus officiis occupari desiderant, ut qui quondam erant comites vel marchiones in sæculo nunc in coquina vel pistrino fratribus servire vel porcos eorum in campo pascere pro summis deliciis computant.*

a male, wholly to the service of God ; that is, to destine him for the spiritual or the monastic order,—as we see in the examples of the mother of the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy, near the beginning of the twelfth century,\* and of the mother of the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux. The boys were trained up under the influence of these sincerely pious mothers, in the society of devout clergymen and monks ; the love for a life consecrated to God was instilled into their youthful minds : and although they might afterwards, in the age of youth, be drawn aside by a different sort of society, by the wild spirit of the times, or by the prevailing enthusiasm for the new paths struck out in science,—from the inclination excited in them in the years of childhood,—still, the deep impression would subsequently be revived again with new force, and so, under peculiar circumstances, recalling the feelings and purposes of former days, the resolution of devoting themselves wholly to monasticism would ripen to maturity in them. Thus were formed the great men of the monastic life. But it so happened, too, that children,—either on occasions like those just mentioned, or else to lighten the expense of a numerous family, were delivered over to convents as *oblats* ; and by such persons, who had not chosen this mode of life of their own impulse, or from their own disgust with a world lying in wickedness, it was followed only because it favoured idleness and easy living. The abbot Guibert complains that, towards the close of the eleventh century, worldly living had, through the multitude of such *oblats*, got the upperhand in the monasteries, whose possessions were wastefully squandered by these monks.† When persons who had

\* See his *Life*, c. iii. When death threatened her and her children, *initur ex necessitate consilium et ad dominicæ matris altare concurritur, et ad eam, quæ sola sive etiam virgo semper futura pepererat, hujusmodi vota promuntur, ac oblationis vice aræ imponitur, quod videlicet si partus ille cecisset in masculum, Deo et sibi obsecuturus clericatui traderetur.*

† *Nostris monasteria vetustissima numero extenuata temporibus, rerum antiquitus datarum exuberante copia, parvis erant contenta conventibus, in quibus perpauci reperiri poterant, qui peccati fastidio sæculum respuissent, sed ab illis potissimum detinebantur ecclesiæ, qui in eisdem parentum devotione contraditi, ab ineunte nutriebantur ætate. Qui quantum minorem super suis, quæ nulla sibi videbantur egisse, malis metum habebant, tanto intra cœnobiorum septa remissione studio victitabant.* See his *Life*, c. viii.

lived from their childhood in absolute dependence and complete retirement from the world, were sent away by their abbots on foreign business, they were the more inclined to abuse a liberty which they now enjoyed for the first time.\* It was a matter of general remark, that young men who turned monks out of penitence for their sins, became afterwards the most distinguished for zeal in their profession; while others, who had not been impelled to the choice of this life by any such powerful inward impulse, and any such deep-felt need, either failed altogether of possessing the right zeal, or else lost what they once had.† Men of the first rank, struck by the force of momentary impressions, or by sudden reverses of fortune, reminded of the uncertain nature of earthly goods, the nearness of death, the vanity of all worldly glory, retired to solitude as anchorets, or entered a monastery; and a single example of this sort would be followed by multitudes. This effect was produced by the example of a certain count Ebrard (Everard) of Breteul, in Picardy, near the end of the eleventh century. He was a young man of noble parentage, and possessed of an ample fortune, who, struck with a sense of the emptiness of all his pleasures, and seized with the craving after some higher good, forsook all, and joined himself with a number of others who travelled about as itinerant charcoal-burners, thus earning their daily bread. "In this poverty," says the writer of the narrative, "he believed that he first found the true riches." Somewhat later he retired with his companions to a convent, having become sensible of the dangers which beset the Christian life in the anchorite condition:‡ one of his contemporaries, Simon, also descended from a very rich and powerful family, was so struck

\* Qui administrationes ac officia forastica cum pro abbatum aut necessitate aut libitu sortirentur, utpote voluntatis propriæ avidi extioresque licentias minus experti, ecclesiasticas occasione facili dilapidare pecunias.

The words of Cæsarius of Heisterbach. *Distinct. I. c. iv*: Rarum esse, quod pueri vel juvenes ad ordinem venientes, quorum conscientias pondus peccati non gravat, ferventes sint, vel in ordine tepide et minus bene vivunt vel ab ordine prorsus recedunt.

‡ How the monastic life was introduced by him from France, and brought into a flourishing state in these districts, is related by the abbot Guibert, *Vita, c. ix*: Cum ad eos (the monks) pretii vix ullus accederet, ad excitandas plurimorum mentes emersit.

at beholding his father's corpse,—a man who but just before held a high place in the world,—as to conceive a disgust of all earthly glory. He at once left his family, and became a monk in some foreign country. When he returned afterwards to his native district, his appearance and words made so strong an impression on men and women, that numbers followed his example. The Cistercian monk, Cæsarius of Heisterbach, in the first half of the thirteenth century, sets forth, in a way that deserves to be noticed, the different causes which led people to embrace the monastic life. What he felt constrained, in the case of some, to attribute to an awakening by divine grace, he found reason in the case of others to ascribe to the instigation of an evil spirit; while in still others, he traced it to fickleness of temper; as, for example, in the case of those who, following the impulse of a momentary and transient interest, mistook their own nature, and neglected to consider whether it was the fear of hell or the longing after a heavenly home that operated upon their feelings. Countless numbers were driven to this step by circumstances of distress; sickness, poverty, imprisonment, shame, remorse following the commission of crime, and the present fear of death.\* When attacked by fatal diseases, many put themselves under a vow that, in case they recovered, they would become monks; or they enshrouded themselves at once in monkish robes, persuaded that by so doing they would be more likely to obtain salvation. And such persons, if they recovered, actually became monks.† Those who had been driven to this step by the fear of death, did not always, however, remain true to a purpose thus conceived; and there were complaints that in changing their garb they had not altered their manners.‡ It happened not unfrequently that criminals on whom sentence of death had been passed were, through the influence of

\* *Distinct. I. c. v.* Cæsarius of Heisterbach cites individual examples to show how a canonicus became a monk, because he had played away his clothes. *I. 9, c. xii.* A young man belonging to a wealthy family thought of turning monk, without the knowledge of his parents, because he had gambled away a large sum of money; but he gave up the notion when a friend came forward and paid up his debts, *c. xxviii.*

† *L. c. c. xxv.*

‡ *Orderic. Vital. hist. L. III. 468,* says of a priest, who had led a trifling life, and in sickness had put on the monkish garb, but afterwards relapsed into his former vicious habits: *Habitus, non mores mutavit.*

venerated abbots who condescended to intercede for them, first pardoned, and then committed to the care of their deliverers, with a view to try what could be done for them under the discipline of the monastery; and as in these times many were hurried into crimes by the impulses of a sensuous and passionate nature, which had never felt the wholesome restraints of education and religious instruction, it was possible that such, by judicious teaching, by the force of religious impressions, and the severe discipline to which they were subjected in a cloister, under the direction of some wise abbot, might be really reformed,—as examples, in fact, show that they sometimes were.\* When Bernard of Clairvaux was once going to pay a visit to his friend, the pious count Theobald of Champagne, he was met by a crowd of men conducting to the place of execution a robber, who, after committing many crimes, had been condemned to the gallows. He begged it as a favour of the count that the criminal might be given up to him. He took the man along with him to Clairvaux, and there succeeded in transforming him into a pious man. This reformed criminal died in peace, after having spent thirty years in the cloister as a monk.† Thus the monasteries proved in some instances to be houses of correction for abandoned criminals; and the spirit of Christian charity, which proceeded from pious monks, first strove to abolish the punishment of death. Another monk, Bernard, founder of the congregation of the monks of Tiron, in the diocese of Chartres, A. D. 1113, had settled himself down near the close of the eleventh century as a hermit, on the island of Causeum (Chaussey), between the island of Jersey and St. Malo. It so happened, while he was there, that pirates landed on the beach with a merchant-vessel which they had captured. Bernard laboured earnestly, but in vain, for the conversion of these barbarians; in vain did he strive to move their pity for the crew, whom they had taken and bound in chains; but

\* An example of this sort is stated by Cæsarius, c. xxxi. of a predatory knight, who, after having been condemned to death, and reprieved at the request of the abbot Daniel of Schönau, was permitted to enter the Cistercian order to do penance for his sins; and he adds: *Frequenter huic similia audivi, scilicet ut homines flagitiosi pro suis criminibus variis suppliciis deputati, beneficio ordinis sint liberati.*

† Vitæ, L. VII. c. xv. ed. Mabillon, T. II. f. 1201.



when they left the shore, he still did not cease praying both for pirates and prisoners. Soon after there came up a great storm; the pirates saw nothing before them but shipwreck and death. Struck with alarm and remorse of conscience, they set free the captives, mutually confessed to each other their sins, and vowed, if they should be saved, to amend their lives, and go on pilgrimages to various shrines. But one of them, on whose heart the words of Bernard had made an indelible impression, reminded the others of this holy man: "They should only vow," said he to them, "that if the Lord would conduct them to the good hermit, they would implicitly follow his direction, and by his mediation they might be saved from death." All united in taking the vow. Four of the ships were foundered; the fifth got safely to the island. The pirates, awakened to repentance, fell down before monk Bernard, and besought him to listen to the confession of their sins, and to impose on them such penance as he thought fit. Some he bade perform their vow of a pilgrimage; others continued to remain under his spiritual direction on the island.\*

In the beginning of the twelfth century, when the enthusiasm for the new dialectic inquiries in France had seized hold on numbers,—and, among the rest, of such as merely followed the current without any call or talent for such studies, many of these soon became disgusted with the idle pursuit, and by this very disgust were led to take a serious spiritual direction in monasticism.† How monasticism was regarded, in its relation to the worldly life, we find expressed in the following remarks of Anselm of Canterbury, where he is exhorting one of his friends to become a monk:‡ "Whatever glory of this world it may be which thou wouldst aspire after, yet remember its end, and the fruit at the end; and then consider, on the other hand, what the expectations of those are who despise all the glory of this world. Dost thou say, it is not monks only who are saved? I admit it; but who attains to salvation in

\* See the account of the Life of Bernard of Tiron, by one of his scholars, c. iv. Mens. April. T. II. f. 229.

† Deprehendentes in se et aliis prædicantes, quia quicquid didicerant, vanitas vanitatum est et super omnia vanitas. Metalog. L. I. c. iv. of John of Salisbury.

‡ Lib. II. ep. 29.

the most certain, who in the most noble way—the man who seeks to love God alone, or he who seeks to unite the love of God with the love of the world? But perhaps it will be said, even in monasticism there is danger! O, why does not he who says this, consider what he says? Is it rational, when danger is on every side, to choose to remain where it is greatest? And if he who seeks to love God alone perseveres to the end, his salvation is secure; but if he who is determined to love the world, does not alter his plan of living before the end, there remains for him either no salvation at all, or else a doubtful or a less one.” Yet here it is all along presupposed that an objective contrariety exists between the inclination to the world and the inclination to God; and not that all activity in relation to the world should be taken up and absorbed in the inclination to God, and animated by that tendency. Men compared monasticism with baptism, as a purification from sin, a renunciation of the world, and regeneration to a new and higher life. It was a prevailing opinion that, by entering upon the monastic life, one was released from the obligation to make a pilgrimage, or to go on a crusade, or to perform any other vow,—an opinion grounded at bottom on the Christian view, that the ruling bent of the heart, submission to God’s will, was more than external and isolated acts. “Whoever vows, when living in the world, to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem or to Rome, and after this becomes a monk,” says Anselm of Canterbury,\* “has performed all his vows at once; for single vows signify only a partial submission to God, with respect to a single matter; but monasticism embraces the whole. After a man has thus embraced the whole, he will not restrict himself again to individual parts.”† An Englishman who had set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem came to Clairvaux, and, attracted by the spiritual society which he there met with, turned monk, and gave up his pilgrimage. The abbot justified this step, in opposition to his bishop, declaring that to “*persevere in a bent of the heart towards the heavenly Jerusalem*” was more than to take one

\* Lib. III. ep. 116.

† Qui voverunt se ituros Romam vel Hierusalem in sæculo, si ad ordinem nostrum venerint, omnia vota sua compleverunt. Quippe qui se in partem Dei per vota tradiderant, postquam se Deo totos tradiderint, totum in partem postmodum non habent redigere. Compl. L. III. ep. 33.

hasty and transient glance of the earthly Jerusalem.”\* The abbot Peter of Cluny wrote to a knight who had promised to become a monk in Cluny, but afterwards determined to go on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem: “It is greater to serve the true God in humility and poverty, than to travel in a showy and luxurious manner to Jerusalem. If there is something good in visiting Jerusalem, where the feet of our Lord have trod, still it is a far better thing to strive after that heaven where we shall see the Lord himself face to face.”†

The influence of monasticism was various and widely extended. Venerated monks were called upon to give their advice with regard to the most weighty affairs. Persons of the highest standing, both of the secular and spiritual orders, noblemen and princes, got themselves enrolled as members of monasteries and monkish orders, for the purpose of sharing in the privileges of prayer and good works (*fratres adscripti* or *conscripti*); by which means these societies were brought into various influential connections. Any recluse who had become known for his pious and strict mode of life was soon looked up to by men of all ranks, from far and near, and was enabled by his counsels and exhortations to make himself widely useful. Such a recluse was Aybert in Hennegau, who lived near the beginning of the twelfth century. So great was the number of people continually flocking to him for the purpose of confessing their sins, that he had scarcely a moment's rest. He gave them spiritual counsel, but not till after they had promised to lay their confession before their ordinary ecclesiastical superiors: only if they declared themselves resolved not to open their breasts to any other confessor he yielded to their importunity, lest they might be driven to despair. At length he received orders from the pope to hear the confessions of all, and prescribe to them the appropriate penance. Whoever could get near enough to his person tried to tear off a piece of his dress and bear it away as a relic, whilst he, resisting, exclaimed: “I am a poor sinner, and by no means what you think me to be.”‡ Monks travelled about as preachers of repentance, and often collected great crowds around them, who, awakened to repentance by their impressive words and

\* Ep. 64.

† Lib. II. ep. 15.

‡ Acta Sanctorum, M. April. T. I. f. 678.

their severely strict mode of living, confessed their sins to them, and avowed their readiness to do anything they might prescribe for the reformation of their lives. They stood to the people in place of the worldly-minded clergy who neglected their duties. They restored peace between contending parties, reconciled enemies, and made collections for the poor. The monasteries were seats for the promotion of various trades, arts, and sciences. The gains accruing from the union of the labours of many were often employed for alleviating the distresses of many. In great famines, thousands obtained from monasteries of note the means of support, and were rescued from threatening starvation.\*

Those, however, who took refuge in the monastery, or even in the retreat of the anchoret, from the temptations of the outward world, were still threatened by dangerous temptations of another kind, when, impelled by the first glow of their zeal they engaged in extravagant self-mortifications. Changes in the tone of feeling would still occur, even after some considerable time had been spent in this mode of life. Too deeply absorbed in their subjective feelings, they would waste themselves away in reflecting on these changeable moods. They felt dearth, emptiness, in their inward being; they failed of experiencing delight, animation in prayer. Evil thoughts gained the advantage in proportion as they allowed themselves to be troubled with them, instead of forgetting themselves in some nobler enjoyment which would tax all the energies of the soul. Thus such men, becoming their own tormentors, fell into despair, and unless better directed by prudent and experienced abbots, might even be tempted to commit suicide; or moments of uncommon religious enthusiasm and fervour would be followed by a reaction of the natural man, hankering after the things of sense or of the understanding, limited to the consciousness of this world; and hence arose moods of scepticism and unbelief.† There was much need, therefore,

\* In the year 1117, when there was a great famine, by which many died of hunger, the monastery of Heisterbach, near Cologne, distributed in one day fifteen hundred alms. Meat, herbs, and bread were distributed amongst the poor.

† We will illustrate this by a few examples related by Cæsarius, in his Dialogues. A young female, belonging to a wealthy and reputable family, had become a recluse contrary to the wishes of her

in the men who presided over these communities of a peculiar love and wisdom, in order to exert a salutary control over these monks, to manage them according to their different temperatures and states of feeling, and to protect them from the dangers to which they were exposed; but when so qualified, these superiors, in exercising such a watch over the welfare of souls, might obtain a rich harvest of Christian experience. They would have first to become acquainted, by their own interior religious experience, with the truths which they afterwards used for the benefit of others. Such wisdom

friends. But she had been deceived with regard to herself; she fell into a state of great depression, and doubted of everything which before had been certain to her. When the abbot to whose care her spiritual concern had been intrusted by the bishop, visited her, and asked her how she did? she answered, "Not well;" and when he inquired of her the reason, she said, "She did not know herself, why she was shut up there." When he told her that it was for the sake of God and of the kingdom of heaven; she replied: "Who knows whether there is a God, whether there are angels, whether there are immortal souls, and a kingdom of heaven? Who has seen them; who has come from the other side and told us about them?" In vain were all the conversations of the abbot: she only begged that she might be released, since she could endure no longer this life of a recluse. But the abbot exhorted her to remain faithful to her purpose, and at least wait seven days longer, at the end of which period he would visit her again. Certainly a very hazardous step to be taken with a person in her condition, which might easily have been followed with the most melancholy consequences, as appears evident from other examples. But, in this instance, the effect was favourable; and when the abbot, who in the mean time had caused many prayers to be offered in her behalf, again visited her at the time appointed, he found the tone of her feelings entirely changed. An extraordinary elevation had followed that season of depression. In a vision, which she saw while in a state of religious excitement, all her doubts had vanished away.—Another aged nun, who had previously been distinguished for her pious walk and conversation, doubted of everything she had believed from the time of her childhood. She would not be spoken to; she maintained that she could not believe, since she belonged among the reprobates. She could not be induced to take part in the holy communion. The prior was indiscreet enough to say, for the purpose of exciting her fears, that if she did not desist from her unbelief, he would after her death cause her to be buried in the fields. To escape this lot she threw herself into the Moselle, but was taken out before she perished.—Another person, who had from his youth up led an unblamable life, fell into absolute despair, utterly doubting that his sins were forgiven, since he could not pray as he had been wont to do: he finally threw himself into a pond, and was drowned. L. c. f. 94, etc. 100.

derived from experience we discern in an Anselm of Canterbury. To certain persons who had requested of him a directory to the spiritual life, he thus writes: "On one point, namely, how you may be able to get rid of an evil will or evil thoughts, take from me this little piece of advice: Do not contend with the evil thoughts or inclinations of the will, but get yourselves right earnestly engaged with a good thought or purpose, till those evil thoughts vanish; for never will a thought or volition be banished out of the heart unless it be by one of an opposite character.\* Manage yourselves, therefore, with reference to unprofitable thoughts, so as to turn your minds with all your power of control over them to the good, so as not to pay the least attention to the others; but if you would pray, or occupy yourselves with a pious meditation, and then such thoughts become troublesome to you, still by no means desist from your pious occupation, but vanquish them in the way described, by contempt. And, as long as you can thus despise them, let them not trouble you, lest by occasion of this anxiety they come up again and torment you anew; for such is the nature of the human soul, that it more often recalls what has given it joy or pain than what it judges to be unworthy of its attention.† Nor should you fear that such motions or thoughts will be imputed to you as sins, provided your will does not go with them; for there is no condemnation in them to those who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." Against a mistake of this sort Bernard also strove to put his monks on their guard. "I exhort you, my friends," says he to them,‡ "to exalt yourselves sometimes above an anxious remembrance of your past conduct to a contemplation of the divine goodness, that you, who are abashed by the contemplation of yourselves, may breathe again by looking away to God. True, pain about sin is necessary; but it should not be a pain that lasts for ever.

\* *Nunquam enim expellitur de corde, nisi alia cogitatione et alia voluntate, quæ illis non concordat.*

† *Similiter se debet habere persona in sancto proposito studiosa, in quolibet motu indecente in corpore vel anima, sicuti est stimulus carnis aut iræ, aut invidiæ aut inanis gloria. Tunc enim facillime extinguuntur, cum et illos velle sentire, aut de illis cogitare, aut aliquid illorum suasionem facere dedignamur.*

‡ See xi. on Solomon's Song, II. f. 1296.

Let it be interrupted by the more joyful remembrance of divine grace, that the heart may not become hardened by grief or wither in despair. The grace of God abounds over every sin. Hence the righteous man is not a self-accuser to the end, but only at the beginning of prayer ; but he ends by ascribing praise to God." Accordingly, he exhorted his monks, from his own experience, not to suffer themselves to be kept from prayer by any momentary feeling of spiritual barrenness. "Often we come to the altar with lukewarm, barren hearts, and address ourselves to prayer ; but if we persevere, grace is suddenly poured in upon us, the heart becomes full, and a current of devotional feelings flows through the soul."\* So he warns beginners especially against the excesses of asceticism. "It is," says he to them, "your self-will which teaches you not to spare nature, not to listen to reason, not to follow the counsel or example of your superiors. You had a good spirit, but you do not use it rightly. I fear that you have received another instead, which, under the appearance of the good, will deceive you, and that you who began in the Spirit will end in the flesh. Know you not that a messenger of Satan often clothes himself as an angel of light? God is wisdom, and he requires a love which, instead of surrendering itself merely to pleasant feelings, unites itself also with wisdom ; hence the apostle, Rom. xii. 1, speaks of a service of God which is reasonable. If you neglect knowledge, the spirit of error will very easily lead your zeal into wrong directions ; and the cunning enemy has no surer means of banishing love from the heart than when he can get men to walk in it improvidently and not according to reason."†

Those dangers of the interior life would especially beset the anchorets who were left to their own feelings, who could find neither counsel nor encouragement in society, and could not be led back from their wanderings to the right path by the guidance of an experienced mind. Hence it was thought necessary to warn men of the dangers to which *this kind of life* was peculiarly exposed. Thus Yves, bishop of Chartres,‡ took ground against those who, puffed up by the leaven of the Pharisees, boasted of their spare diet and bodily mortifications,

\* In *Cantica canticorum*, s. x. s. 7.

† L. c. s. xx. s. 7.

‡ Ep. 192.

whereas, according to the declarations of the apostle, 1 Timoth. iv. 8, bodily exercise profiteth little, and the kingdom of God, Rom. xiv. 17, consisteth not in meat and drink, but in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. The solitude of groves and of mountains cannot make a man blessed unless he brings with him that solitude of the soul, that sabbath of the heart, that elevation of the spirit, without which idleness and storms of dangerous temptation attend every solitude, and the soul never finds rest unless God hush to silence these storms of temptation. "But if you have his grace with you," he writes, "be assured of blessedness in whatever place you may be; in whatever order, in whatever garb, you may serve God."\* A certain monk proposed to exchange the life of the convent for that of solitude; but he warned him not to do so.† He bid him remember that Christ left the wilderness to engage in public labours; hence he declared the life of the anchorite inferior to that of the monastery, because in the former the man is abandoned to his self-will and his own troublesome thoughts, which disturb the quiet of the soul. This he had learned from the experience of many who had before led a blameless life, but after becoming anchorites, fell into lamentable aberrations. That warm and hearty devotee to the work of missions, Raymund Lull, complains of it as a great evil that pious monks retired into solitudes, instead of giving up their lives for their brethren, and in preaching the gospel among the infidels. "I behold the monks," says he, "dwelling in the country and in deserts, in order to avoid the occasions of sin amongst us; I see them ploughing and cultivating the soil, in order to provide the means of support for themselves, and to supply the necessities of the poor; but far as I can stretch my eyes and look, I can scarcely see an individual who from love to thee goes forth to meet the death of the martyr, as thou didst from love to us." He longs for the time, which he describes as a glorious day, when pious monks, skilled in languages of foreign nations, shall follow the example of the apostles, and, betaking themselves amongst the infidels, stand ready to lay down their lives in preaching the faith. Thus would the holy zeal of the apostles return.‡ The abbot Peter

\* L. c.

† Ep. 256.

‡ O gloriose Domine, quando erit illa benedicta Dies, in qua videam, quod sancti religiosi velint te adeo laudare, quod cant in terras externas



of Cluny writes to a recluse,\* that "his outward separation from the world would avail him nothing if he was destitute of the only firm bulwark against besetting sins within the soul itself. This bulwark is the Saviour. By union with him, and by following him in his sufferings, he would be safe against the attacks of all enemies, or able to repel them. Without this protection it was not of the least use for one to shut himself up in solitude, mortify the body, or travel to foreign lands; but he would only expose himself thereby to more grievous temptations. Every mode of life, that of laymen, of clergymen, of monks, and particularly that of anchorets and recluses, has its peculiar temptations. First of all, the temptations of pride and of vanity. The anchoret takes delight in picturing to his fancy what he is by this mode of life more than others. The solitary, uniform life, in inactive repose, he cannot bear, and yet he is ashamed to abandon a mode of living which he has once chosen;† the repressed impulses seek room for play, therefore, in some artificial manner. Thousands flock to consult him as an oracle, and to ask his advice about everything. They make confession of their sins to him, and implore his spiritual counsel. They invite him to aid them by his intercessions in a great variety of matters, and offer him presents. Thus both his ambition and his avarice are gratified: while he exhorts people to give to the poor, he may amass great treasures for himself." After the manner here described, persons who had begun as strict anchorets, might soon, through the excessive veneration which was shown them and the numerous presents which they received, be turned away from the course which they had chosen. Many monkish institutions, governed by the strictest rule, degenerated in this way; impostors, too, would sometimes take advantage of the popular

ad dandam laudem de tua sancta trinitate et de tua sancta unitate et de tua benedicta incarnatione et de tua gravi passione? Illa dies esset dies gloriosa, et dies, in qua rediret devotio, quam sancti apostoli habebant in moriendo pro suo Domino Jesu Christo. In the magnus liber contemplationis in Deum, opp. T. IX. f. 246.

\* Lib. I. ep. 20.

† Præ tædio dormitando, ipsius miserabilis tædii non in Deo, sed in mundo, non in se, sed extra se quærit remedium. Nam quia semel assumptum propositum eremitam deserere pudet, quæritur occasio frequentis alieni colloquii, ut qui multa de se tacens tormenta patitur, aliorum saltem confabulationibus relevetur.

credulity, contrive to render themselves famous as strict anchorets, and thus make themselves rich.\* The monks, who roved about as preachers of repentance, might produce great effects amongst the uneducated and neglected people; but when powerful compunctions, showing themselves outwardly by sensible signs, resulted from these impressions, and an excitement of this kind, accompanied with strong sensuous elements, seized irresistibly on the multitude, it required consummate wisdom to give the right direction to such a movement of the affections, so that nothing impure might intermingle, so that the sensuous element might not prevail over the spiritual, and give birth to a fanaticism which would even run into immorality, as it was said to have done in the case of a certain Robert of Arbrissel.† Amongst the vast multitude of monks there were many who embraced this mode of life only for the purpose of obtaining consideration and an easy living, while they spent their time in idleness; and if, on the one hand, there were pious monks who exerted a powerful and wholesome influence on the religious feelings and the religious education of multitudes; so there proceeded, on the other hand, from the ranks of the uneducated or hypocritical monks active disseminators of every kind of superstition. Abelard was one who stood forth as a stern reprover of this class of monks. He describes how those who had retired from the world became corrupted by the veneration in which they were held, fell back again into the world, paid court to the rich, and, instead of speaking to their consciences, lulled them to security in their sins by teaching them to depend on their intercessions.‡

\* Thus, it is related in the life of the abbot Stephen, of Obaize, in the province of Limousin, in the first half of the twelfth century, that a person had settled down there as an anchoret, and built himself an oratory. He gladly received whatever the people brought him, and what he could make no use of himself he converted into money. Once he appointed a day on which they were to assemble there together to hear a mass. Many came in the morning, but found him no longer there. He had absconded with all he possessed. Hence there was a want of confidence in that district towards all who represented themselves as anchorets. See L. I. c. iv. in Baluz. Miscellan. T. IV. p. 78.

† See farther onward.

‡ Sint, qui longa eremi conversatione et abstinence tantum religionis nomen adepti sunt, ut a potentioribus sæculi vel sæcularibus viris sub aliqua pietatis occasione sapius invitentur et sic diabolico cribro more

He applies to such the words in Ezek. xiii. 18: "Woe to you that sew pillows to all armholes, and make kerchiefs upon the heads of young and old, to catch souls!" "What other meaning has this, than that we pacify the consciences of worldly people by our sweet words, instead of improving their lives by our honest reproofs?"\* In like manner Hildebert of Mans boldly unmasked the hypocritical monks. "Let his pale, haggard countenance," says he, "excite reverence; let him stand forth, in coarse and squalid raiment, the stern censor of manners; yet for all this he is far astray from the path that leads to life."† Raymund Lull, in one of his books, where he relates the wanderings of a friend of that true wisdom which begins in the love of God (*philosophia amoris*), describes ‡ how, in his search after this true love, he comes to a monastery that stood in the highest reputation for piety. Rejoiced at beholding so many united together in offering praise to God, he thinks he has at last found the dwelling of true love. Soon, however, he observes a monk with a patched cowl, but he was a hypocrite; for though he fasted, preached, laboured, and prayed abundantly, yet he did it only for the sake of being regarded as a saint by the others. Beside him stood another, who fasted and prayed still more. He did so, however, because he supposed that God would certainly make him so holy that he might be able to work miracles, and so be venerated as a saint after his death.§ Here the joy of the lover of true wisdom vanished; for he could nor help seeing how much he was dishonoured by such conduct, who alone

paleæ ventilati, de eremo removeantur in sæculo. Qui multis adulationum favoribus dona divitum venantes tam suam, quam illorum jugulant animas.

\* Quid est autem pulvillos cubitis vel cervicalia capitibus supponere, nisi sæcularium hominum vitam blandis sermonibus demulcere, quam nos magis asperis increpationibus oportebat corrigere. Quorum dona quum sustulerimus. eos utique de suffragio nostrarum orationum confidentes, in suis iniquitatibus relinquimus securiores. De Joanne baptista sermo, opp. Abælardi, p. 954.

† Ut in eo adoretur osseus et exanguis vultus, ut sermo censorius ei sit et cultus incultior, extra viam est, quæ ducit ad vitam. Ep. 11.

‡ In his Arbor philosophiæ amoris, opp. T. VI. f. 56.

§ Hoc faciebat ideo, quia habebat opinionem, quod Deum ipsum deberet facere tam sanctum, quod etiam posset facere miracula, et cum esset mortuus, quod de ipso singulis annis fieret solenne festum.

should command the love of all. Even that enthusiastic friend of the contemplative life of the monk, abbot Joachim, declared, that while a monk who stands firm under temptations attains to the highest degree of the spiritual life, so one that yields to them becomes the worst of men. "Let a monk once become wicked," said he, "and there is not a more covetous and ambitious creature than he is."\*

Casting a glance at the various monastic societies, which sprang up within this period, we notice, in the first place, those which derived their origin from efforts of reform amongst the clergy; and which may, therefore, be regarded as a medium of transition from the clerus to the body of monks. Among these belongs the order of Præmonstrants, whose founder, Norbert, was born in the city of Xantes, in the dukedom of Cleves, between A. D. 1080-1085. Descended from a family of note, he lived at first after the manner of the ordinary secular clergy, sometimes at the court of the archbishop Frederick the First of Cologne, sometimes at that of the emperor Henry the Fifth. But in the year 1114, being caught by a storm, while riding out for his pleasure, a flash of lightning struck near him and prostrated him to the earth. On recovering his breath and coming to his senses, he felt admonished by the thought of the sudden death from which he had been saved as by a miracle, and resolved to begin a more serious course of life. From this incident he was led to compare the history of his own conversion with that of the apostle Paul, and to represent it as partaking of the miraculous. He laid aside his sumptuous apparel for a humbler dress, and, after a season of earnest spiritual preparation, entered the order of priests. In Germany and in France he itinerated as a preacher of repentance, and by his admonitions and reproofs restored peace between contending parties. He rebuked the worldly-minded clergy, and the degenerate canonical priests. By this course, however, he made himself many enemies, and was accused of preaching where he had no call to preach. He found a protector in pope Gelasius the Second, who gave him full power to preach wherever he chose. He was every-

\* Nec putes ambitione monachum non esse tentandum, quia mortuus est mundo, quia nihil, si malus est, ambitiosius monacho, nihil avarius invenitur. In the Concordia veteris et Novi Testamenti, c. ii. p. 109.

where received with great respect. Whenever he entered the vicinity of villages or castles, and the herdsmen saw him, they left their cottages and ran to announce his arrival. As he proceeded onward the bells rang; young and old, men and women, hastened to church, where, after performing mass, he spoke the word of exhortation to the assembled people. After sermon he conversed with individuals on the concerns of the soul. Towards evening he was conducted to his lodgings, all were emulous of the honour and blessing of entertaining him as a guest. He did not take up his residence, as was customary with itinerant ecclesiastics and monks, in the church or in a monastery, but in the midst of the town, or in the castle, where he could speak to all, and bestow on such as needed the benefit of his spiritual advice. Thus he made himself greatly beloved among the people. In the year 1119 he visited pope Calixtus the Second, in Rheims, where that pope had assembled a council. This pope confirmed the full powers bestowed on him by his predecessor, and recommended him to the protection of the bishop of Laon. The latter wished to employ him as an instrument for bringing back his canonical priests to a life corresponding to their rule; but meeting here with too violent an opposition, Norbert withdrew from the field; as the bishop, however, wished to retain him in his diocese, Norbert chose a desert region in it, the wild valley of Premonstre (*Præmonstratum Pratum monstratum*) in the forest of Coucy, as a suitable spot for a retreat. Such was the first foundation of a new spiritual society, which, attaching itself to the so-called rule of Augustin, aimed to unite preaching and the cure of souls with the monastic life. From this spot he travelled in every direction to preach,—to France, to Flanders, and to Germany, at the invitation of ecclesiastics, communities, and noblemen. The pious count Theobald of Champagne proposed uniting himself, and all he possessed, with the new spiritual foundation; but Norbert dissuaded him from his purpose by showing him how much good, of which he might be the instrument as a prince, would thus be prevented. “Far be it from me,” said he to the count, “to harbour a wish of disturbing the work which God is doing through you.” When, finally, he became archbishop of Magdeburg (1126), he sought, but not without violent opposition, to introduce his order there. He died A.D. 1134.

Norbert was one of the number also, about whom marvellous stories were circulated. But if the veneration of the multitude, and the enthusiasm of some of his disciples, attributed miracles to him, yet, the more critically examining, and we must add, inimically disposed Abelard, accuses him of ambitiously seeking after this reputation, of obtaining it by deceptive arts; and when his promises were not fulfilled, of ascribing the failure to the unbelief of others.\*

We should here mention also, as belonging to the same age, Robert of Arbrissel. He had been carried away in his youth by both tendencies of the enthusiasm of his times, the scientific and the religious. After having pursued his studies with great zeal at Paris, he gained considerable celebrity by his attainments in science, and also by his strictly ascetic and pious life. The bishop of Rennes, who was possessed of a zeal for reform,—induced by the high reputation of the young man, drew him to his church, where he laboured four years as priest. He attached himself to the Hildebrandian movement for the reformation of the church, and was zealous in opposing the corruption of morals in the clergy, and in upholding the severity of the laws of celibacy, and against simony. He was a forcible preacher, and his discourses produced many of those effects which we have already noticed as attending the influential preachers of these times. After the death of his bishop he betook himself to the solitary life. His reputation attracted to him numbers of both sexes, who wished to train themselves under his direction in the way of spiritual living.

\* Thus, when others told of Norbert, that, not long before his death he called the dead to life, Abelard ridiculed his vain attempts to raise the dead. *Ad majora illa veniam et summa illa miracula de resuscitandis quoque mortuis inaniter tentata. Quod quidem nuper præsumsisse Norbertum et coapostolum ejus Farsitum mirati fuimus et risimus. Qui diu pariter in oratione coram populo prostrati et de sua præsumptione frustrati, cum a proposito confusi deciderent, objurgare populum, impudenter cœperunt, quod devotioni suæ et constanti fidei fidelitas eorum obsisteret. Sermo de Joanne baptista, p. 967.* It is worthy of note, that the Præmonstrant, who wrote Norbert's life, makes no mention of his having raised the dead, and that in his prologue he declares: Many things must be passed over on account of the infidels et impii, qui quidquid legunt et audiunt, quod ab eorum studiis et conversationibus sit alienum, falsum continuum et confictum esse judicare non metuunt, ea duntaxat breviter attingens, quæ omnibus nota sunt neque ipsi ulla improbitate audeant diffiteri. *Acta Sanctor. Mens. Jun. T. I. f. 819.*

Pope Urban the Second conferred on him the dignity of apostolic preacher, by virtue of which he might travel about everywhere, and call sinners to repentance, and restore peace between contending parties. He exercised an astonishing power over men and women. Vicious persons were so influenced by it as to make full confession of their sins to him, and promise amendment. Others, who had led an upright life in the world, were persuaded wholly to forsake it. Such, for example, was the effect produced by the society of this man on the mother of the famous abbot Peter of Cluny, who entertained him for a while in her house. She secretly vowed that she would become a nun, and resolved to execute her vow as soon as her husband died, or would permit her to do so.\* It was said of his sermons, that every individual who heard them felt the words to be aimed at himself as much as if they were addressed to him personally and with design.† There was formed under his direction a religious society composed of persons of both sexes, and of ecclesiastics and laymen, whom he denominated the *Pauperes Christi*. His admirers were disposed to regard the moral effects that resulted from his labours as something beyond miracles; and it deserves notice that, although he produced such powerful impressions by his preaching, yet during his lifetime not a single miracle was ascribed to him,—the reason of which may doubtless be found in the peculiar spirit of his labours; for on this point, the enthusiastic admirer who wrote his life, says, that miracles wrought within men's souls are more than those performed on their bodies.‡ The enduring monument of his activity was

\* Words of the abbot Peter of Cluny, concerning his mother: *Famoso illi Roberto de Brussello ad se venienti et secum aliquamdiu moranti impulsu violento æstu animi se in monacham ignorante viro redderet, ut eo defuncto vel concedente statim ad fontem Ebraudi, si viveret, demigraret.* Epp. L. II. ep. 17.

† Bishop Baldric, in the account of his life, at the 25th of February, c. iv. s. 23: *Tantam prædicationis gratiam ei Dominus donaverat, ut cum communem sermocinationem populo faceret, unusquisque quod sibi conveniebat, acciperet.*

‡ This is evident, from the beautiful words in the account of his life, c. iv. s. 23: *Ego audenter dico, Robertum in miraculis copiosum, super dæmones imperiosum, super principes gloriosum. Quis enim nostri temporis tot languidos curavit, tot leprosos mundavit, tot mortuos suscitavit? Qui de terra est, de terra loquitur et miracula in corporibus admiratur. Qui autem spiritualis est, languidos et leprosos, mortuos*

the order of nuns at Fontevraud (Fons Ebraldi), a convent not far from the town of Candès in Poitou. It is impossible to mistake the marks which show that this man was actuated by a glowing zeal for the salvation of souls; though we must confess that, as in the case of many powerful preachers of times so given to the eccentric, his zeal may not have been accompanied with a spirit of prudence, nor exempt from fanatical excesses; and some of the bad effects which attached themselves to the great results of his labours may doubtless have proceeded from these causes. His enthusiastic admirers will not allow us, it is true, to perceive any mixture of lights and shades in the picture they have drawn of him; but the way in which the abbot Gottfried of Vendôme, and bishop Hildebert of Mans, or Marbod of Rennes, describe his labours, contain features too characteristic to leave it possible for us to conceive that they should have been pure inventions, and they moreover agree with other kindred examples of these times.\* If the squalid raiment in which he travelled about as a preacher of repentance contributed to procure for him the reverence of the multitude,—and he is said to have given it himself as a reason for wearing them, that they drew more veneration from the simple; yet there were others who blamed him for attempting to distinguish himself in this way, and complained that he did not dress according to his station, as a canonical ecclesiastic and priest. They styled it only a species of vanity, and assured him that to reasonable people he must appear like a crazy man.† By censuring the worldly-minded

quoque convalescere testatur, quando quilibet animabus languidis et leprosis suscitandis consulit et medetur.

\* Even if the persons mentioned were not the authors of these letters, if one or the other of them was written by Roscelin, a truth of this kind may have been lying at bottom. This Roscelin, when a canonical priest, was an adversary of Robert Arbrissel, who seemed desirous of transforming the regular clergy into monks. Abelard says of him (ep. 21): *Hic contra egregium illum præconem Christi Robertum de Arbrosello contumacem ausus est epistolam confingere.*

† Ep. Marbod, among the letters of Hildebert, f. 1408: *De pannosi habitus insolentia plurimi te redarguendum putant, quoniam nec canonicæ professioni, sub qua militare cœpisti, nec sacerdotali ordini, in quem promotus es, convenire videtur. Est enim singulis quibusque professionibus sive ordinibus apta quædam et congrua distinctio habenda, quæ si permutetur, publicum offendit judicium. Videamus ergo, ne ista, per quæ admirationem parare volumus, ridicula et odiosa sint.* That he went



clergy in which he followed altogether the spirit of the Hildebrandian party, he drew after him the multitude, who delighted in such things. On the other hand, it is said, in the letter above noticed, "of what use is it to censure the absent? So far from being of any use, it must seem to his ignorant hearers, as if he gave them liberty thereby to sin,—holding up to them, as he does, the example of their superiors, whose authority they might plead. By such censures the absent would rather be excited to indignation than persuaded to amendment. Of some advantage, however, it was perhaps to himself to make every other order of the church contemptible in the eyes of the multitude, so that he and his followers might stand alone in their esteem. Such cunning, however, savours of the old man; it is something diabolical. It accords not with his calling, with his itinerant wanderings, with the squalid dress he wears. The congregations leave their priests, whom they are taught to look upon as worthless; they despise their intercessions, and will no longer submit to church penance from them; will no longer pay them tithes and firstlings. To him and his followers they flock in crowds; and to him and his, pay the honour which they owe to their own priests. Yet these poor people are not influenced by the love of religion, but manifestly by that love of novelty which is ever a ruling passion with the multitude;\* for nobody can perceive any amendment in their lives." It was now objected to him generally, that he placed too much reliance on momentary feelings of compunction, and made no further inquiry into the temper of those on whom his discourses had produced an effect. He was accused of saying, that he was satisfied could he prevent a man from sinning, even for a single night. He was accused of accepting at once every man, who, after some such superficial impression, expressed a wish to retire from the world. Hence, people of this class fell afterwards into a worse state than ever. He was accused of a pharisaical zeal to make proselytes. "So great is the number of his dis-

about in a cowl full of holes, barefoot, and with a long beard, as a novel sight for all, ut ad ornatum lunatici solam tibi jam clavam deesse loquantur. Hæc tibi non tam apud simplices, ut dicere soles, auctoritatem, quam apud sapientes furoris suspicionem comparant.

\* Quos tamen, ut manifestum est, non religionis amor, sed ea, quæ semper vulgo familiaris est, curiositas et novorum cupiditas ducit.

ciples," said these adversaries, "that they may be seen with their long beards and their black dresses running in troops through the provinces; wearing shoes in the country, going barefoot in the towns and villages. And if these people are asked why they do so, the only reply they have to make is, 'They are the people of the Master.'" Especially was he censured for his manner of operating upon the female sex; for his too free intercourse with them, and for his renovation of the dangerous fanaticism of the *subintroductæ*.\* He is said to have allowed himself to be influenced in his conduct towards the female sex too much by whim and caprice; to some, being too lenient; to others, too severe; imposing on them too harsh modes of penance. Gottfried of Vendôme,—who intimates, however, that this charge against Robert of Arbrissel came by no means from credible sources,†—represents to him how tenderly the weaker sex should be dealt with; how easily many might by his mode of treatment be reduced to despair.‡

We noticed, at the close of the preceding period, the origin of the order of Cluny; and we have described the high consideration it attained through the merits of the men who stood at its head. In the beginning of this period the friend of Gregory the Seventh, abbot Hugo, joined himself to it; but so much the more mischievous in its influence on the order was the bad administration of his successor, Pontius, who was finally obliged, in the year 1122, to resign his post. Soon afterwards the place was filled by one who is to be numbered among the most distinguished men of the church in his times, the abbot Peter Mauritius, to whom even his contemporaries gave the title of Venerable. By him, the order was once more raised to distinction. He was descended from a family of consideration in Auvergne, and is to be reckoned among the many great men of the church on whose development the influence of Christian training by pious mothers had a lasting effect. The character of his mother, who later in life became a nun, was delineated by his own pen with filial affection,

\* Συμβισακτος, vol. I. 277, and vol. II. 149.

† *Quod si ita est*, IV. 46.

‡ *Fragilis est multum et delicatus sexus femineus et ideo necesse est, ut pietatis dulcedine potius quam nimia severitate regatur, ne forte abundantiori tristitia absorbeatur, et qui cum regere debet, sic a satana circumveniat.*

soon after her death.\* Under him the order took a different direction from that in which it had originated. As this man, distinguished for his amiable and gentle spirit, strongly sympathized with everything purely human, so, under his guidance, the monastery, before consecrated alone to rigid asceticism, became a seat also of the arts and sciences.† A Christian delicacy of feeling, far removed from the sternness and excess which we elsewhere find in monasticism, forms a characteristic trait in the character of this individual. To a prior, who was not disposed to relax in the least from the zeal of an over-rigid asceticism, he wrote: "God accepts no sacrifices which are offered to him contrary to his own appointed order." He held up to him the example of Christ: "The devil invited Christ to cast himself down from the pinnacle of the temple; but he who came to give his life for the salvation of the world refused to end it by a suicidal act—thereby setting an example which admonishes us that we are not to push the mortification of the body to self-destruction.‡ So Paul, also (1 Timothy v. 23), following the example of Christ, exhorts his disciple, that he should provide for his body with moderation, not that he should destroy it." He blames him for not heeding the affectionate remonstrances of the pious brethren amongst his inferiors. "When a man pays no regard to those who speak such words of love, he despises the love itself which prompted such words; and he who despises love, can have none himself. But of what avail is all the fasting in the world, and all the mortification of the flesh, to him who has no love? (1 Cor. xiii.) Abstain, then, from flesh and from fish; push thy abstinence as far as thou wilt; torture thy body, allow no sleep to thine eyes; spend the night in vigils, thy day in toils; still, whether willing or unwilling, thou must hear the apostle: 'Even if thou givest thy body to be burned, it profits thee nothing.' " Far removed from this monkish estrangement from humanity, he was aware that the suppression of man's natural feeling stood at variance with the essence

\* Lib. II. ep. 17.

† Lib. III. ep. 7. He praises a monk who diligently devoted himself to scientific studies: *Monachum longe melius Cluniaci, quam quemlibet philosophum in academia philosophantem stupeo.*

‡ *Ut doceret, utiliter quidem carnem esse mortificandam, sed non more homicidarum crudeliter perimendam.*

of Christianity; on which point he thus expresses himself in a beautiful letter to his brother, on the occasion of their mother's death: "The feelings of nature, sanctified by Christianity, should be allowed their rights in the free shedding of tears. Paul (1 Thess. iv. 13) does not object to sorrow generally, but only to the sorrow of unbelief, the sorrow which contends against Christian hope." \* To a monk who thought himself bound to keep away from his native country, lest he should be attracted by some earthly tie, he wrote: † "If pious men must abhor their country, Job would not have remained in his; the devout Magians would not have returned to theirs; our Lord himself would not have rendered his own illustrious by his miracles. The pious then are not obliged to fly from their country, but only from its customs if they are bad. Neither ought the good man to fly from his relations and friends, from fear of the contamination of wickedness; rather he should endeavour to win them to salvation by wholesome admonitions; he should not be afraid of their earthly affections, but rather seek to communicate to them his own heavenly affections. "I myself," said he, "would gladly retire into solitude; but, if it is not granted me, or until it is granted me, let us follow the example of him who, amidst the crowd in royal banquets and surrounded by gilded walls, would say he dwelt in solitude (Ps. lv. 8, according to the Vulgate). And such a solitude we can construct in the recesses of the heart, where alone the true solitude is found by true despisers of the world,—where no stranger finds admittance; where, without bodily utterance, is heard in gentle murmurs the voice of our discoursing Master. In this solitude, let us, my dearest son, so long as we are in the body, and dwell as strangers on the earth,—even in the midst of tumults,—take refuge; and what we would seek in distant countries, find in ourselves; for the kingdom of God is indeed in us." His letters evidence the intimate communion of spirit which he cherished with those of kindred disposition among the monks. Thus he writes to one of them: "When I would search with thee into the mysteries of the Holy Scriptures, thou didst always come and join with me with the greatest

\* Non noster talis dolor, quem generat non fidei defectus, sed nulla lege prohibitus mutæ germanitatis affectus. Non noster talis fletus, quem fundimus, non futurorum desperatione, sed naturæ compassione.

† Lib. II. ep. 22.

delight. When I would converse with thee on matters of worldly science, though still under the guidance of divine grace, I found in thee a ready mind and an acute discernment. O, how often, with the doors shut, and him alone for our witness who is never absent where thought and discourse dwell on him, has awful converse been held by us, on the blindness and hardness of man's heart; on the various entanglements of sin, and of the manifold snares of wicked spirits; on the abyss of the divine judgments; how have we, with fear and trembling, adored him in his counsels respecting the children of men—when we considered that he has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and hardens whom he will; and that no man knows whether he deserves love or hatred; on the uncertainty of our calling;\* when we meditated on the economy of salvation, by the incarnation and sufferings of the Son of God; on the dreadful day of the last judgment!† With great boldness he told even the popes their faults. Thus he wrote to Eugene the Third:‡ “Though you have been set by God over the nations, in order to root out and to pull down, to build and to plant (Jerem. i. 10); still, because you are neither God nor the prophet to whom this was said, you may be deceived, betrayed, by those who see only their own. For this reason, a faithful son, who would put you on your guard against such dangers, is bound to make known to you what has been made known to him, and what you perhaps may still remain ignorant of.”

When the Cluniacensian order had thus departed from its ancient austerity, and when milder principles prevailed in the Benedictine monasticism generally, there sprung up, out of a certain tendency to reform, an enterprise by which the strictness of the older models was to be again revoked to life. *Robert*, who came from a noble family in Champagne, had, in his childhood, been presented by his parents as an *oblatus* to a monastery; but as monasticism nowhere came up to his high requisitions, he joined himself to a society of anchorets, who led a strict life in the forest of Moslesme. The high consideration which this society attained to, by its strict mode of living, procured for it unsought rich gifts; and the increase of earthly goods was followed as usual by relaxation. Hence

\* We perceive here the influence of the Augustinian doctrine.

† Lib. II. ep. 22.

‡ Lib. VI. ep. 12.

Robert, together with twenty of the most zealous of these recluses, was induced to separate from the rest. With his companions he retired to a lonely district, called Citeaux (Cistercium), in the bishopric of Chalons, not far from Dijon. Here was formed, some time after the year 1098, a society of monks, over which Robert presided. But he could not carry his work here to its full completion, for the monks of Moslesme contrived to obtain an order from pope Urban the Second, by virtue of which the abbot Robert was obliged to return, and assume the direction of that monastery. He left his disciple Alberic at the head of the new establishment. Pope Paschalis the Second confirmed the rule of the new monastic order, which had been drawn up after the benedictine rule, but with greater severity. The new monasteries presented a picture of the extremest poverty, and in this respect stood in striking contrast with the monasteries of Cluny, which in some cases were distinguished for the embellishment of art. The defenders of the hitherto current form of the Benedictine monasticism objected, however, to the abbot Robert, that he clung tenaciously to the letter of the Benedictine rule, as the Jews to the letter of the law ; \* and they maintained, in opposition to him, that the strictness of ancient monasticism had been properly modified, with a due reference to the difference of climate.† Under the third abbot of Citeaux, Stephen Harding, this new order of monks had but few members left, its excessive severity having frightened numbers away. It was first by means of an extraordinary man, who belonged amongst the most influential of his times, that this order attained to higher consideration, and became more widely spread. This was the abbot Bernard of Clairvaux, whose spirit, life, and labours we must here consider more in detail.

Bernard was born in the year 1091, at Fontaines, in Burgundy, not far from Dijon. His father was a respectable knight; and on his education, as in so many other cases, a pious mother, Aleth, exerted the greatest influence. All her seven children, six sons and a daughter, she brought, as soon

\* See the words of the worthy English Benedictine, Ordericus Vitalis, *Hist. eccles. L. VIII. f. 713*, where, speaking of those who retired with Robert to Cistercium, he says: *Qui sancti decreverant regulam Benedicti, sicut Judæi legem Moysi ad litteram servare penitus.*

† Orderic. Vital., *Hist. eccles. L. VIII. f. 712.*

as they saw the light, to the altar and consecrated to God. The third of these sons, Bernard, already exhibited, while a child, a predominant religious bent, which under the influence of such a mother developed itself at a very early period.\* After the death of his mother, the young man fell into a kind of society by which he was drawn away from that earlier bent. Yet this had been too deeply ingrained into his disposition not to put forth in the end a mightier reaction against all the impressions made on him at a later period, and he determined to break loose from all worldly ties and become a monk. His brothers, not pleased with this design, tried to dissuade him from it, and to counteract the love of monasticism by another of the nobler tendencies of these times, the enthusiasm for science, which now began to manifest itself, especially in France. This attempt was not altogether unsuccessful; but the memory of his mother revived in him the impressions of his childhood; he often saw in fancy her image before him, and heard her admonishing voice. Once, when on his way to pay a visit to his brother, who was a knight, and then engaged in beleaguering a castle,—he was so overwhelmed with these recollections as to feel constrained to enter a church on the road, where, with a flood of tears, he poured out his heart before God, and, solemnly consecrating himself to his service, resolved to execute the above-mentioned plan of life. And it is characteristic of the man, that he chose at once as his ideal the strictest monasticism of this period, by which so many others were frightened away from it. By the invincible fervour of his zeal, which expressed itself in the force of his language and in his whole demeanour, several of his relatives and friends, and all his brothers except the youngest, who was still a child,† were immediately carried away, and induced to

\* Suffering, when a lad, under severe headaches, a woman came to him and promised to cure him by incantations and amulets; but he repelled her proposals with great indignation. Once, on Christmas-eve, he was at church, and having waited longer than usual for the commencement of service, fell asleep, and had a vision of Christ, who appeared to him as a child. See the account of Bernard's life by one of his disciples, the abbot William, in Mabillon, *L. I. c. ii. s. 4.*

† The following incident illustrates one characteristic feature in the life of this period. The eldest of these brothers, Guido, happening to see the youngest, Nivard, playing with other boys in the street, called out to him, and said: "You are now owner of all our property." To which

join him in his resolution. In the year 1113, he entered, with thirty companions, into the monastery of Citeaux.

He was a monk with his whole soul. In bodily labours, as well as in spiritual exercises, he sought to come fully up to the ideal of the monastic life. He himself was compelled afterwards to lament that, in the first years of his life as a monk, he had so enfeebled his body by excessive asceticism, as to find himself afterwards disqualified from completely fulfilling the duties of his station.\* But his wide and diversified labours show to what extent the energy of a mind actuated by a sense of the highest interests, could find ways of making even so frail a vessel serviceable, and of overcoming the obstacles of a sickly constitution.† And in these times his very looks, which bore the marks of this rigid self-discipline, only created for him the greater respect. The fiery energy with which he spoke and acted, contrasted with the weakness of his bodily frame, only produced so much the mightier effects.‡

In the three years during which he remained at Citeaux, he gained in this way so high a reputation, that at the early age of five and twenty he was placed himself at the head of a monastery. In a desert and wild valley inclosed by mountains, lying within the bishopric of Langres, which in earlier times, having been a nest of robbers, was called the Valley of Wormwood (*Vallis absinthialis*), and afterwards when cleared of

the lad replied, "What! *you* have heaven, and *I* the earth? That is no equitable division."

\* In the account of his life already cited (c. viii. s. 41), it is said of him, Non confunditur usque hodie se accusare, sacrilegii arguens semetipsum, quod servitio Dei et fratri abstulerit corpus suum, dum indiscreto fervore imbecille illud reddiderit ac pæne inutile.

† When, during the schism under pope Innocent the Third, he was under the necessity of journeying to Italy: Instantissima postulatione imperatoris apostolicoque mandato nec non ecclesiæ ac principum precibus flexi dolentes ac nolentes, debiles atque infirmi, et, ut verum fateor, pavidæ mortis pallidam circumferentes imaginem trahimur in Apuliam. Epp. 144, s. 4.

‡ In the first account of his life, L. c. : Quis nostra ætate, quantumvis robusti corporis et accuratæ valetudinis tanta aliquando fecit, quanta iste facit et facit moribundus et languidus ad honorem Dei et sanctæ ecclesiæ utilitatem? And from immediate observation, his biographer could say : Virtus Dei vehementius in infirmitate ejus refulgens extunc usque hodie digniorem quandam apud homines ei efficit reverentiam et in reverentia auctoritatem et in auctoritate obedientiam.



them, Clear Valley (*Clara vallis*), it was proposed to found a new monastery of Cistercians; and this, from its location, received the name of Claravallis, or Clairvaux. Bernard was made abbot of it in the year 1115, and this monastery became thenceforth the seat of his multifarious labours, which extended abroad from this point through the whole of Europe. From that time, men of all ranks and stations, knights and scholars, were attracted to the Cistercian order. The strictness which had hitherto kept back so many, now acted as a charm on others. Monasteries after the pattern of Clairvaux sprang up in the deserts, whose very names were intended to denote what the interior life could gain in them.\* Within thirty-seven years the number of convents subordinate to the abbot of Cîteaux was increased to sixty-seven.

Under Bernard's direction, the above-named monastery, situated in an uncultivated region, earned so much by the hard labour of the monks, that during a severe famine in Burgundy, when crowds of famishing poor poured in from all quarters to the gates of the convent, two thousand, selected from the multitude and marked by a peculiar badge attached to their persons, were supplied for several months with all they needed for their sustenance, while others at the same time received indiscriminate alms.† The monastery of Clairvaux became the model of monasticism; and colonies from it, to found other establishments after the same pattern, were demanded from all quarters; so that the abbot Bernard sometimes found himself unable to comply with all the invitations that were sent to him. To all parts of France, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Germany, England, Ireland, Denmark, and Sweden, monks must be sent from Clairvaux for the purpose of founding new

\* Ordericus Vitalis, the friend of the old man says: *Multi nobiles athletæ et profundi sophistæ ad illos pro novitate singularitatis concurrerunt et inusitatam distractionem ultro complexantes in via recta læti Christo hymnos lætitiæ modulati fuerunt. In desertis atque silvestribus locis monasteria proprio labore condiderunt et sacra illis nomina solenti provisione imposuerunt, ut est Domus Dei, Claravallis, Bonus mons, et eleemosyna et alia plura hujusmodi, quibus auditores solo nominis nectare invitantur festinanter experiri, quanta sit ibi beatitudo, quæ tam speciali denotetur vocabulo.* Hist. eccles. L. VIII. f. 714.

† See the account of the life of John Eremita the Second, 6, in his works, ed. Mabillon, f. 1287.

monasteries or of reforming old ones ; \* and thus Bernard, at his death, in 1153, left behind him one hundred and sixty monasteries, which had been formed under his influence. Hence he had connections and correspondents with all these countries ; and the establishments which had thus arisen ever regarded him as their father and teacher. Hence his letters and his influence would be widely diffused through all these lands. He was the counsellor of noblemen, bishops, princes, and popes. As we have seen, he was often summoned to their assistance, to settle disputes, to quiet disturbances ; insomuch that he was constrained to lament over the little opportunity that was left him, in the multiplicity of external business, to lead the kind of life which became a monk.† The general enthusiasm demanded him for bishop in many of the more important cities,—such as Langres, Chalons sur Marne, Rheims, Genoa, and Milan ; but he declined every such invitation.‡ Before princes and nobles he stood up as an advocate for the unfortunate, and for the victims of injustice ; he stimulated those who attached themselves to his person, to benevolent enterprises, and directed them in such undertakings by his counsel. Amongst the latter belonged particularly the count Theobald of Champagne. He directed that nobleman in establishing a fund for the support of poor people, the interest of which should go on continually increasing, and thus secure a permanent and accumulating capital for relieving the wants of the needy.§ Although a religious interest, based on his view of the church theocracy, as we have unfolded it on a former page, induced him to enter the lists in defence of the papal authority ; and, although he was a zealous instrument in promoting the higher objects of the popes ; yet he was no advocate of a blind obedience to them, and boldly exposed to them the wicked acts perpetrated in their name ; so that his interference in public affairs was sometimes extremely irksome

\* See the second account of his life by Bernald, iv. 26 ; and the third, vii. 22.

† *Amici, qui me quotidie de claustro ad civitates pertrahere moliuntur.* Ep. 21.

‡ See the second account of his life by Bernald, iv. 26.

§ *L. c. viii. 52. Eleemosynas ea sagacitate disponere, ut semper fructificantes rediivis et nascentibus accessionibus novas semper eleemosynas parturirent.*

to the more important personages near the papal court. Strongly as he recommended in general, as a monk, obedience to superiors, yet he also declared himself opposed to too broad an interpretation of this duty. "Were a blind and implicit obedience, submitted to without examination, to become the general rule," says he, "the words we hear read at church: 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good,' would be without meaning. We should have to expunge from the gospel the words: 'be wise as serpents,' and retain only, 'be harmless as doves.' True, I do not say that the commands of superiors ought to be examined by subordinates, where nothing is commanded which is contrary to the divine law; but I affirm that *wisdom* is also necessary to detect whatever may be commanded contrary to those laws; and *freedom* to regard every such command with contempt.\* Say, suppose one should place a sword in your hand, and bid you point it against his own throat, would you obey him? Or, if he bid you plunge into the flames or into the flood, would you not be yourself a partaker of the crime, were it in your power to prevent another from so doing and you failed to exert it?"† This principle, he applies, in the letter where it is expressed, to the relation of men to the pope; and he sets the command of Christ, the high-priest of all, over against such a supposed command of the pope. His own conduct was ever in accordance with this principle. He shrunk not from writing to Innocent the Second, that the popes themselves had contributed most to injure their own authority, by abusing it.‡ "It was the unanimous voice of all who presided over the communities with a sincere regard for their well-being, that justice in the church was falling to decay; the power of the keys reduced to nothing; the episcopal authority losing all respect;—since no bishop was allowed to punish wickedness in his own diocese, and this, owing to the action of the pope and the Roman court; for men said, whatever good thing the bishop may devise, it is sure to be frustrated there; whatever evil they have rightly removed, is sure to be again introduced. All the

\* Nec dico, a subditis mandata præpositorum esse dijudicanda, ubi nihil juheri deprehenditur divinis contrarium institutis, sed necessariam assero et prudentiam, qua advertatur, si quid adversatur et libertatem, qua et ingenue contemnatur.

† Ep. 7, s. 12.

‡ Quid vobis vires minuitis? Quid robur vestrum deprimitis? Ep. 178.

vicious, the quarrelsome, who have been expelled by them from the communities, from the body of the clergy, or of the monks, run up to Rome, and boast of the protection which they there find."\* •

We have already spoken of the great power exercised by Bernard over the minds of men, when, in the name of pope Eugene, he preached up the crusade in France and Germany. Though at that time many deceptions, whether intentional or undesigned, were mixed in,† under the name of miraculous cures, yet we cannot suppose the former in the case of such a man as Bernard; and unintentional deception would not suffice to explain the general belief of Bernard's miraculous powers, nor the several stories so circumstantially narrated.‡

\* *Quique flagitiosi et contentiosi de populo, sive de clero aut ex monasteriis pulsati currunt ad vos, redeuntēs jactant et gestiunt, se obtinuisse tutores, quos magis ultores sensisse debuerant.*

† Abelard, who with critical understanding examined into the tales of miraculous cures in his times, speaks of it: *Non ignoramus astutias talium, qui cum febricitantes a lenibus morbis curare præsument, pluribus aliqua vel in cibo vel in potu tribuunt, ut curent, vel benedictiones vel orationes faciunt. Hoc utique cogitant, ut si quoquomodo curatio sequatur, sanctitati eorum imputetur. Sin vero minime, infidelitati eorum (i. e. of those on whom the cure had been performed) vel desperationi adscribatur. De Joanne baptista, opp. p. 967.*

‡ Concerning a boy born blind, to whom he restored sight, in the district of Liege, we find the following account by the monk Gottfried, of Clairvaux, in L. IV. vi. 34. Transported at the first ray of light, to him before wholly unknown, the boy cried out "I see day, I see everybody, I see people with hair!" and clapping his hands for joy, he exclaimed, "My God! now I shall no more dash my feet against the stones!" In Cambray, he cured a deaf and dumb boy; and, as soon as he could speak, the multitude set him on a wooden bench, that he might salute the people with his new gift of speech, and his first words were received with a shout of joy. This monk relates still another case of which he was an eye-witness, L. c. s. 39 (*e plurimis sane, quæ in ejusdem apostolici viri facta sunt comitatu, duo scribimus, quæ nos oblivisci ipsa, quam vidimus magnitudo lætitiæ non permittit*). At Charlerie, a country town not far from the city of Provins, a boy ten years old, who had been for a year so lame in all his limbs as to be unable to move a single member, not even his head, was presented to him, as he passed along the street, by the lad's parents and other relations. Bernard touched him, and signed the cross over him; when, at his bidding, he rose up and walked. The lad was now unwilling to leave his benefactor, who had given him the use of his limbs, till Bernard obliged him to do so. His younger brother embraced him, as if he had been restored from the dead, and many were moved to tears. Four years afterwards, his mother brought him again to Bernard, as he

Whether it was that the confident faith excited by the strong impression which this extraordinary man everywhere made, produced so great effects, and the religious susceptibility of the times, in which the element of a critical understanding was so repressed by that of immediate religious feeling, came to his assistance; or, whether he possessed some natural, magnetic power of healing (a supposition which I see no reasons for adopting); the fact was, Bernard himself avowed the conviction, that God did perform miracles by him; as, for example, in that letter to pope Eugene the Second, already quoted, where he refers to what he had accomplished in rousing up Europe to engage in the crusade.\* So, after fighting down the heretics in the south of France, he appeals, in a letter to the citizens of Toulouse, to the fact,† that he had revealed among them the truth, not merely by word, but also by power.‡ As solitary workings of that higher power of life which Christ introduced into human nature, these facts might perhaps be properly regarded, wherever they appeared in connection with a genuinely Christian temper, actuated by the spirit of love. Evidence, for this reason, in favour of the entire truth of the doctrines promulgated, they at the same time certainly were not; for that higher power of life, whose fountain-head is union with Christ, does not necessarily exclude errors; and moreover, the supposed miracles may have belonged to the Old Testament position of this period.

Still there were, even then, persons who, in the conflict with the prevailing spiritual tendencies of their times, doubted or denied the truth of those miraculous stories; persons, to be sure, who cannot be regarded as unprejudiced witnesses,—who were not at all less biassed than his enthusiastic admirers, though on a different side,—the representatives of that critical bent of the understanding which was most directly opposed to the spirit of Bernard,—Abelard and his disciples. These seem not to have acknowledged Bernard's miraculous gifts. Abelard, it is true, in a passage already quoted,§ does not speak of

happened to be passing through the town a second time; and she bade her son kiss his feet, saying to him, "This is the man who restored life to *you* and you to *me*." \* Page 210. † Ep. 242.

‡ Veritate nimirum per nos manifestata non solum in sermone, sed etiam in virtute. § Page 355.

his miracles, precisely after the same manner in which he does of the miracles of others, which he directly pronounces a delusion; nor does he mention him by name. But proceeding as he does on the general assumption, that miracles were no longer wrought in his age, he seems to make no exception of the case of Bernard; and the way in which Abelard's talented but haughty disciple, Berengar, expresses himself, would lead us to infer from the whole tone of his remarks, though he nowhere disputes the truth of those miraculous stories, yet his own incredulity with regard to them.\*

He himself, for that matter, was far from over-estimating the value of such miraculous gifts, which he describes as something rare in this time, and difficult of attainment. He advises that men should rather bend all their efforts in striving after those *Christian virtues* without which the church cannot exist, and, above all, *charity*, than to be very anxious after *these things*,—which served only as an ornament to the church, —which were not necessary to salvation, and which were attended with many dangers.†

Connected with Bernard's participation in the crusades, was the part he took also in an undertaking designed for the promotion of the same object, the *order of Knight Templars*. This order of spiritual knights had been already founded nine years, but consisted of only eighteen members; when, through Bernard's co-operation, it received a newly modified rule, at the council of Troyes, in 1127, and Bernard's participation in it gave the whole affair a new impulse. In compliance with the wish of its first master, Hugo de Paganis, he wrote a discourse of exhortation and encouragement for the use of the

\* He says, manifestly with sarcasm, Jamdudum sanctitudinis tuæ odorem ales per orbem fama dispersit, præconizavit merita, miracula declamavit. Felicia jactabamus moderna sæcula tam corusci sideris venustata nitore mundumque jam debitum perditioni tuis meritis subsistere putabamus. Sperabamus in linguæ tuæ arbitrio cœli sitam elementiam, æris temperiem, ubertatem terræ, fructuum benedictionem. Sic diu vixisti, ut ad semicinctia tua rugire dæmones autumaremus et beatulos nos tantulo gloriaremur patrono.

† Istiusmodi ligna in opus laquearium ad decorem Domus Dei (quæ magis noscuntur apta ornatui, quam necessaria fore salutis), quoniam istiusmodi ligna constat et laboriose quæri et difficile inveniri et periculose elaborari (nam et rara ea præsertim his temporibus terra nostra producere reperitur). Sermo xlv. in Cantica canticor. s. 8.

members: "Exhortatio ad milites templi." He extols this order as a combination of monasticism and knighthood, contrasting it with the common knighthood, which was only subservient to wicked ends, and inspired by sinful desires and passions. He describes the design of it as being to give the military order and the knighthood a serious Christian direction, and to convert war into something which God might approve. "Even infidels," says he, "should not be put to death, if in any other way they could be prevented from persecuting and oppressing Christians;"\* and, as in favour of the crusades generally, so also in favour of this order of knights devoted to the same object, he makes it a prominent argument, that Christendom would thereby be relieved from a multitude of mischievous men, that these men would be called to repentance, and rendered serviceable to the church.†

What pre-eminently distinguished this great man was, that to a bent of mind profoundly contemplative, a rich inward experience, he united such a many-sided activity directed on the outward world. As in his own case religious knowledge proceeded from interior experience, so he endeavoured to guide his disciples and contemporaries to this fountain-head of the knowledge of divine things, as opposed to a predominantly scientific direction of the Christian mind.‡ Monasticism was so highly valued by him, because he considered it a school for this theology of the heart. Thus he wrote to a scholastic theologian, whom he invited to become a monk.§ "Thou, who busiest thyself with the study of the prophets, understandest thou what thou readest? If thou dost understand it, then thou knowest that the sense of the prophets is Christ; and, if thou wouldst have him, know that thou wilt succeed far better by following him than by reading. Why seekest thou

\* Non quidem vel pagani necandi essent, si quo modo aliter possent a nimia infestatione seu oppressione fidelium cohiberi. II. 4.

† Quodque cernitur jucundius et agitur commodius, paucos admodum in tanta multitudine hominum illo conflare videas, nisi utique sceleratos et impios, raptores et sacrilegos, homicidas, perjuros, et adulteros. Sic Christus, sic novit ulcisci in hostem suos, ut non solum de ipsis, sed per ipsos quoque frequenter soleat tanto gloriosius, quanto et potentius triumphare, s. 10.

‡ Which we shall describe more exactly in the fourth section.

§ Ep. 106.

in the word *that Word*, which stands already before thine eyes as the Word become flesh? He who has ears to hear, let him hear *him* crying in the temple: 'If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink;' and, 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' O, if you had but a taste of the rich marrow of the grain with which the heavenly Jerusalem is satisfied, how gladly wouldst thou leave those Jewish scribes to nibble their crusts of bread." Then, he adds, "Believe one who has experience, thou wilt find more in the forests than in books. Woods and stones will teach thee what thou canst not learn from the masters."\* It was one of Bernard's inspiring thoughts, that the right knowledge of divine things was only such a knowledge as proceeds from the interior life, from the impress of the divine upon the disposition. Planting himself upon the words, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," he says: "Knowledge makes men learned, the disposition makes them wise."† "The sun does not *warm* all upon whom it *shines*; so wisdom does not inflame all whom she teaches *what* to do, with the *desire* to do it. It is one thing to know about many treasures, another to possess them; and it is not the knowledge, but the possession, that makes one rich. So it is one thing to know God, and another to fear him; and it is not the mere knowledge, but the fear of God, which moves the heart, makes one wise." Knowledge is to him but a preparation for true wisdom. It leads to the latter only when that which is known is taken up into the heart, and the heart is moved by it. "Yet pride," he imagines, "is very apt to proceed from mere knowledge where the fear of God does not present a counterpoise."

But it was especially the principle of a love exalted above fear and the desire of reward, which he was accustomed to regard, and to recommend to his monks, as the soul of Christian perfection. Hence pre-eminently above every other pious man of his times, he was called the man of love;‡ though, in a practical view, Peter of Cluny might undoubtedly claim this

\* *Experto crede, aliquid amplius invenies in silvis, quam in libris. Ligna et lapides docebunt, quod a magistris audire non possis.*

† *Instructio doctos reddit, affectio sapientes.* S. xxiii. in *Cantica canticor.* s. 14.

‡ *Acta Sanctor. M. Jun. T. I. f. 826.*



title in preference to all others. When he was called to Italy, in the contest for the cause of the pope, and was compelled to travel far and undergo much fatigue, he wrote to his monks,\* that, amid all his toils, he found the greatest consolation in reflecting that he laboured and suffered in his cause for whom all things live. "I must, whether willing or unwilling, live for him who has acquired a property in my life, by giving up his own for me." To have their lives also consecrated solely to him was his exhortation to his monks.† "To whom," he wrote, "am I more bound to live than I am to him whose death is the cause of my living? To whom can I devote my life with greater advantage than to him who promises me the life eternal? To whom with greater necessity, than to him who threatens the everlasting fire? But I serve him with freedom, since love brings freedom.‡ To this, dear brethren, I invite you: serve in that love which casteth out fear, feels no toils, thinks of no merit, asks no reward, and yet carries with it a mightier constraint than all things else. No terror so spurs one on, no reward so strongly attracts, no demand of a due so pressingly urges. This love binds you inseparably with me, this love makes me ever present with you, *especially in the hours when I pray.*" Touching the essence of disinterested love, Bernard says:§ "Not *without reward* is God loved, though he should be loved without *respect to a reward*. True love possesses enough in itself, it *has* a reward; but it is nothing other than the very object that is loved." He distinguishes, however, four stages in the progressive development of love. The lowest stage is where a man is drawn away from selfish interests, by means of self-love, to the love of God. Sufferings are ordained to the end that man may be awakened to the consciousness of dependence on God, and, by seeking after help in distress, be led away to God; but must not his heart be harder than iron or stone, who, after having often turned to God in distress and found help from him, does not become so softened that he must begin to love him for his own sake? Thus he attains to the second stage, where God is loved no longer merely as a helper in distress, but on account

\* Ep. 144. s. 3.

† Ep. 143.

‡ Sed servio voluntarie, quia caritas libertatem donat.

§ De diligendo Deo, c. vii.

of the experience which has been had of the blessed effects of communion with himself. As those Samaritans said to the woman who had informed them of the coming of the Lord: "Now we believe, not because of thy saying, for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world;" so we too may rightly say to the flesh: "Now we love God, not on account of thy distress, but because we ourselves have experienced and know that the Lord is gracious. Thus, by degrees, we attain to the third stage, which is, to love God not only on account of the way in which he has manifested himself to ourselves, but for his own sake, to love him as we are loved; we, too, seeking not our own but the things of Jesus Christ, as he sought our good, or rather us, and not his own. From this is developed, finally, the fourth and highest degree of love, where self-love passes wholly up into the love of God, and the man loves even himself only for God's sake." Bernard finds this stage of love described in Ps. lxxiii. 26: "My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever." "Blessed and holy," says he, "would I call him to whom it is granted in this mortal life rarely, occasionally, or even but once, and that only for a moment, to experience something of this kind; for so to lose thyself thine *I*, so to renounce thyself, this is heavenly converse, and not feeling, after the ordinary manner of man. As the glory of God is the end of all creation, so the point towards which all progress in religion strives is, to do all things only for God's sake. This ground-tone of the soul is, properly speaking, transformation into the image of God; but here below man can sustain himself but for a few moments in these heights." "I know not," says Bernard, "whether by any mortal this fourth attainment has been completely realized in the present life. Let them maintain that it has who have experienced it: to me it seems impossible. Without doubt, however, it is then to be realized when the good and faithful servant shall enter into the joy of his Lord."

It is everywhere apparent that the reference to Christ constituted with him the soul of the Christian life. "Thus," he says,\* "dry is all *nutriment* of the soul, if it be not anointed

\* S. xv. in *Cantica canticor.* s. 6.

with this oil. When thou writest, nothing touches me if I cannot read Jesus there; when thou conversest with me on religious subjects, nothing touches me unless Jesus chimes in; but he is also the only true *remedy*. Is any one among you troubled? Let Jesus enter into his heart, and lo! at the rising light of his name, every cloud is dispersed and serenity returns. Here is a man full of despondency, running to entangle himself in the snares of death; let him but call on the name of life, and will he not at once recover the breath of life? Where did ever hardness of heart, indolence, or ill-will abide the presence of this holy name? In whom does not the fountain of tears begin at once to flow more copiously when Jesus is named? In what man that trembled at danger does not the invocation of his name of power at once infuse confidence? In what man that wavered in doubt does not the light of certainty beam forth at the invoking his glorious name? In whom that grew faint-hearted in misfortune, was there ever lack of fortitude when that name whispered, I am with thee? Certainly, these are but diseases of the soul, but this is the remedy. If, for example, I name Jesus as *man*, I present to myself the meek and lowly of heart; the man radiant with all virtue and holiness; the same who is also Almighty God; who can heal me by his example, and strengthen me by his grace. Of all this the name of Jesus at once reminds me. From the man I take my example; from him who is mighty my help; and of both I compound a remedy for my case such as no physician could provide for me."

But as the discrimination of the different stages of religious progress, suggested by his own rich spiritual experience and by observation derived from watching over the souls of others, distinguished Bernard, so he went on to mark differences of degree in the love to Christ, as he had done before in the love to God. At one stage he placed the love possessed by such as are still governed by the outward senses,—love excited by sensible impressions; at another, the love of those who are capable of rising above the appearance in the flesh to the divine in itself, and live in that. "Remark," says he,\* "that *this* love of the heart is still in some measure a fleshly one,

\* S. xx. in Cantica canticor. s. 6.

when it is moved chiefly by a regard to Christ manifest in the flesh, to what he did and commanded in the flesh. He who is full of this love is easily bowed down with contrition at the mention of Christ. When he prays, the holy image of the God-man stands before him,—born, teaching, dying, rising again, or ascending up to heaven; and whatsoever of this sort may present itself to his soul must either enkindle the soul to the love of the virtues, or expel the vices of the flesh, and quell its impulses. I think this especially to have been the reason why the invisible God was pleased to manifest himself in the flesh, and to hold intercourse with man as man; it was that he might first draw all the inclinations of the carnal men, who can love only carnal things, to the soul-saving love of his own flesh, and thus to elevate them by degrees to a spiritual love. At this stage were still to be found those who said ‘Lo, we have left all and followed thee,’ Luke xviii. 28. Assuredly, it was love of his bodily presence alone which had induced them to leave all; and hence they could not patiently hear the announcement of his approaching sufferings which were to bring salvation; but Christ pointed them to a higher stage of love when he said, ‘It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.’ To this higher state *he* doubtless had already attained who said, ‘Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we *him* no more.’” Bernard marks the difference between a Christian who is easily touched by the remembrance of Christ’s sufferings—and, by the blessed experience of these pious feelings, is incited to aspire after all goodness—and the Christian who, more and more purified and ennobled by such feelings, has finally attained to a steadfast zeal for righteousness and truth,—who, becoming a stranger to all vain glory, abhors calumny, knows nothing about envy, despises all human glory, avoids, as it were instinctively, all sin, and embraces everything good.

True humility in judging of one’s self, he declared to be more than prolonged fastings, late vigils, and any bodily exercise,—the true godliness which is profitable unto all things, 1 Tim. iv. 8.\* As it turned out with many who embraced the monastic life, that their corrupt inclinations

\* Ep. 142.

broke out with the more force in proportion to the narrower room left for the indulgence of them,—so Bernard found it necessary to rebuke the odious practice of slandering the character of others under some hypocritical form of piety. In what he says he discovers his profound knowledge of mankind: “First we hear, as the premonitory sign, a deep sigh; then, with a certain dignity, with a certain hesitation, with a sorrowful look, with a lamenting tone—behold! the calumny is uttered, and the word spoken gains the more power of begetting conviction because the hearers believe it has been uttered unwillingly, and more out of pity and sympathy than out of malice. ‘It gives me great pain,’ says one, ‘for I love the man sincerely, and never could cure him of this fault.’ Says another, ‘I knew that of him very well, yet by me it was never divulged to any one, but now it has been told by somebody else, I cannot deny its truth; with pain I say it, the fact is really so.’ And he adds, ‘a great pity, for in most other respects he is without a fault, but on this point, to confess the truth, he is altogether inexcusable.’”\* “The first thing for every man,” says Bernard, “is self-knowledge; the *first*, because every man is his own neighbour; the *most profitable*, because such knowledge does not puff up, but humbles, and prepares the way for edification,—for the spiritual building cannot stand firm unless it rests on the solid foundation of humility; but nothing is better calculated to lead the soul to humility than a knowledge of itself as it is.”† “If a soul,” says he in another place,‡ “has once learned and obtained from the Lord the power of turning inward upon itself, of panting in its inmost depths after God’s presence, of continually seeking the light of his countenance,—I know not whether such a soul would consider the suffering of hell itself for a season as a greater punishment than,—after having once tasted the bliss of this spiritual direction, to be turned back again to the allurements,—say, rather, to the hardships of the flesh.”

\* XXIV. in *Cantica canticor*, s. 4. It is the same thing as was objected by Berengar, Abelard’s disciple, to the Carthusians: *Quid prodest, fratres, exire in eremum et in eremo habere cor Ægyptium? Quid prodest, Ægypti ranas vitare et obscœnis detractionibus concubare? Opp.* Abælard. p. 326.

† S. xxxvi. in *Cantica cantico*. s. 5.

‡ L. c. s. xxxv. s. 1.

As the Cistercian order gave a new impulse to strict monasticism, so it rapidly extended itself,—thus exciting the jealousy of the older monkish societies, over which it threatened to elevate itself.\* Hard feelings grew up, especially between the old order of the Cluniacensians and the new one of the Cistercians. The Cistercians were distinguished already by their white cowls from the Cluniacensians, who still retained their black ones. The Cistercians stood pre-eminent for the severity of their asceticism, while it was undoubtedly the case that into the Cluniacensian order there had been introduced, under the former administration, a sort of luxury which was very much disapproved of by the abbot Peter himself, and which he held it necessary to keep in check.† The two heads of these monkish orders, Bernard of Clairvaux and the abbot Peter, were strangers to those little jealousies of the monks which kept them in a state of mutual hostility. The complaints of the Cluniacensian abbot William, led Bernard to compose a tract‡ on the relation in which these two orders of monks stood to each other. He laid it down, in the first place, that the unity of the church must present itself under manifold forms of life and of institutions. But, through love, everything becomes, in a sense, common to all: each appropriating all to himself that proceeds from the same spirit.§ As to outward labours, he belonged, it is true, to but one order; but by love he felt united to all. Nay, by love one possesses more than he does that performs the very work, if it be not done in the spirit of love. Then he severely censures the Cistercian monks, who set up themselves as judges over another man's servants; who discerned the mote in another's eye, but saw not the beam in their own eyes; who, in the matter of external observances, accused others of violating the Benedictine rule, while they did not hesitate to violate that

\* Thus says Ordericus Vitalis, f 714: *Novæ institutionis æmulatores dispersi sunt in Aquitania, Britannia, Gasconia, et Hibernia. Mixti bonis hypocrītæ procedunt, candidis seu variis indumentis amicti homines illudunt et populi ingens spectaculum efficiunt. Veris Dei cultoribus schemate, non virtute, assimilari plerique gestiunt suique multitudine intuentibus fastidium ingerunt et probatos cœnobitas, quantum ad fallaces hominum obtutus despicabiliores faciunt.*

† L. VI. ep. 15.

‡ The Apologia ad Gulielmum Abbatem.

§ The pluralis unitas and una pluralitas of the ecclesia militans.

rule themselves in regard to the more essential matters belonging to the spiritual life; for the kingdom of God is one within us, consisting not in meat and drink, but in righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost,<sup>†</sup> not in word, but in power. Why should they concern themselves so much about the external matter of the monkish dress? Why neglect the weightier matter,—the soul's interior dress, piety and humility? Those outward observances ought not by any means, indeed, to be lightly esteemed; to him they appeared to be the necessary means of training for the spiritual life. Yet the mere form, without the animating spirit just spoken of, was unmeaning.\* Next he censures the misgrowths of monastic life, to be found in many branches of the Cluniacensians that had degenerated into luxury; the pomp and state affected by many abbots; the splendour and excessively gorgeous art in the churches, chapels, and monasteries; the pictures, which fastened the eyes of the worshippers, calling forth the admiration of art and repressing the feelings of devotion.<sup>†</sup> He sees something Jewish in this,—something derogatory, therefore, to the peculiar essence of that purely spiritual worship of God which Christianity brings with it.<sup>‡</sup> He looks upon it as a masterly device of cupidity; for by the admiration of pictures, in the loftier style of art, and in great variety, men were very easily drawn to make donations. Men flock in crowds to kiss the decorated images of saints, and they are enchained by their admiration of the beautiful more than by reverence for the saints.§ The bishops were obliged to let themselves down to the different degrees of culture among the men whom they had to deal with; to them, therefore, he conceded the right of employing such sensuous means, to excite the devotion of the sensuous multitude. But it was otherwise with the monks, who, dead to the sensible world, ought no

\* Neque hæc dico, quia hæc exteriora negligenda sunt, cum potius spiritualia, quanquam meliora, nisi per ista aut vix aut nullatenus vel acquirantur vel obtineantur, sicut scriptum est, non prius quod spirituale, sed quod animale, deinde quod spirituale.

† Quæ dum orantium in se retorquent adspectum, impediunt et affectum.

‡ Mihi quodammodo repræsentant antiquum ritum Judæorum.

§ Ostenditur pulcherrima forma sancti vel sanctæ alicujus et eo creditur sanctior, quo coloratur. Currunt homines ad osculandum, invitantur ad donandum et magis mirantur pulchra quam venerantur sacra.

longer to need such outward means of excitement, but should strive rather to reach the ideal of the purely spiritual worship of God. Thus Bernard recognizes in the rest of the church a still predominating element of Jewish sensualism; and he represents monasticism as destined to prove the chief means of emancipating the Christian life from this contamination, and of presenting Christianity in its pure spirituality. The abbot of Cluny also holds to the position, that the church cannot exist without the unity of the Spirit in the manifoldness of customs and regulations; and that love should reconcile all differences,—love, without which all mortification of the flesh is a thing of naught.\*

Among the societies of anchorets, the order of Carthusians deserves particularly to be noticed. Its founder was Bruno, a pious ecclesiastic of Cologne,† distinguished as a scholar; afterwards master of the cathedral school at Rheims. Over this church presided at that time one of those worldly-minded men, who valued the spiritual office only as a means of gain, and of gratifying their love of pomp and luxury. This was the archbishop Manasseh, a man whose character is aptly set forth by one of his own remarks: “The archbishopric of Rheims would be a fine thing were it not necessary to hold mass in order to enjoy its revenues.”‡ It was the impression which this profanation of holy things, and a mode of life so utterly at variance with the spiritual calling, made on the more serious minds, that induced Bruno, along with several others like-minded, to seek after a strictly ascetic life in solitude. In the wild valley of Chartreux (Cartusium), not far from Grenoble, he settled himself down, about the year 1084, with twelve companions.§ They built a monastery, indeed, in which they held their meetings; but instead of taking up their residence in it, they lived in separate cells by the side of it, where each individual spent the whole day by himself in silence, occupied with devotional exercises, spiritual studies, or corporeal labour. They despised all pomp and ornaments, even in what belonged to the service of the church. They refused to accept of gold

\* IV. 17; VI. 3.

† Born in the year 1040.

‡ Bonus esset Remensis archiepiscopatus, si non missas inde cantari oporteret. Guibert. Novig. de vita sua, L. I. c. xi.

§ We follow here the credible narratives of the contemporary Guibert, without paying any regard to legends of much later origin.



or silver ; only the communion-cup might be of silver. The abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy, gives a remarkable example, showing how tenaciously they clung to these principles. A pious count, attracted by the fame of their strict mode of life, once paid them a visit, and earnestly exhorted them to abide faithfully by their principles. He warned them of the degeneracy which usually followed the first strict life of the monks, when the fame of their strictness had brought them into the possession of property. The impression left on him, however, by observing their singular mode of life, induced him afterwards to expose them to a temptation quite inconsistent with his own exhortations. He sent them a costly vase and cups of silver. The monks immediately sent them back, declaring that "they wanted gold and silver neither to give away, nor to decorate their church ; to what use could they put it then?" The count, upon this, sent them bales of parchment, which they needed much ; for as other occupations did not comport with their quiet, solitary mode of life, they preferred to employ their leisure hours in transcribing books ; and they made themselves useful by multiplying copies of the Bible, and old theological works. The greatest treasure which they possessed was their library ; and the Carthusians distinguished themselves above all the other monastic orders in that they continued to maintain unaltered their strict mode of living and their contemplative habits, when their order came to be more generally respected, and their monasteries more splendidly endowed.\*

\* The (perhaps German) monk Nigellus Witeker, who, in a satirical work, directed against the follies of all classes in his times, and entitled *Brunellus*, or *Speculum Stultorum* (a work composed in the beginning of the thirteenth century, and which did not spare even the monks), cannot reproach the Carthusians, as he does the others, with hypocrisy and effeminacy. Speaking of a visit which he proposed making to the order, he says—

*Cella mihi dabitur, quam solum solus habebō,  
Nemo mihi socius, nemo minister erit.  
Solum enim psallam solusque cibaria sumam :  
Et sine luce meum solus adibo thorum.  
Carne in æternum cuncti prohibentur ab esu  
Præter eum, si quem tabida lepra tenet.  
Ad fora non veniunt : quo litem scire resolvant :  
Nec populi vanum depopulantur ave.  
Hospitis adventu gaudet mutantque diem am.  
Dant quod habent hilari pectore, voce, manu.*

Which passage, besides being found in the complete edition of this poem

There was another order of anchorets, who came from the East, and obtained from their original seat the name of *Carmelites*. Mount Carmel, in Palestine, had from the earliest times been an object of peculiar veneration and worship on account of its connection with the prophets Elijah and Elisha (1 Kings xviii. 19; 2 Kings ii. 25; iv. 25). The cave where, according to tradition, the prophet Elijah had lived, was visited by many, and anchorets settled down upon spots in the vicinity. When, in the year 1185, the Greek monk and priest Johannes Phocas visited these regions,\* he found there the ruins of an old and extensive monastery; and he reports that, a short time before, an old monk and priest from Calabria had, in consequence of a vision of the prophet Elijah, chosen this spot, erected upon it a tower and a small church, which he occupied with about ten companions. This person from Calabria is supposed to have been a certain Berthold.† From these small beginnings rose up the order of the Carmelites, who, near the commencement of the thirteenth century, obtained a rule from the Latin patriarch, Albert of Jerusalem. This rule, transplanted to the West, would necessarily be subjected to many alterations.

The Christian love which led men to undergo every self-denying sacrifice with cheerfulness and joy, and which overcame every feeling of disgust, gave birth to many societies of monks, having it for their object to provide physical and spiritual relief for the unfortunate, and those who were cast off by all the world. Among the dreadful plagues of the Middle Ages belonged especially the sacred fire, or St. Anthony's fire, a disorder which, after inflicting the most painful sufferings, carried off multitudes, or else left them to wear out the remainder of their days with a body rendered helpless by distortion or incurable lameness; another was leprosy. The first-mentioned fearful disorder raged especially in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.‡ During the time when this plague

is printed also in the Extracts by Martene and Durand: *Amplissima collectio*, T. VI. f. 7.

\* As he states, in his report concerning the holy places, published by Leo Allatius, in the Collection of Symmicta.

† See the accounts collected in the *Actis Sanctorum*, at the 8th April.

‡ Sigebert of Gemblours, an. 1089: *Annus pestilens maxime in occidentali parte Lotharingæ, ubi multi sacro igne interiora consument*

was making its most extensive ravages, Gaston, descended from a family of consideration amongst the French nobility, in gratitude for his own recovery and that of his son, which he attributed to the mediation of St. Anthony, founded and consecrated to that saint a society, of which the express object was to furnish nurses for persons sick with that disorder.\* Societies were formed of laymen and ecclesiastics, who, following the so-called rule of Augustin, under the direction of a superior (*magister*), spent their time in taking care of the sick in hospitals; and still other societies of men, who devoted themselves more especially to taking care of the leprous, and founded large establishments for the express purpose of receiving and nursing them. The ecclesiastics in such societies attended to the religious wants of patients; preached to them, gave them the benefit of their pastoral care, and the sacraments. The laymen undertook to do everything necessary for their bodily relief and comfort; also to provide for the decent burial of the dead, according to the usual forms. The Dominican Humbert de Romanis, who lived near the close of the thirteenth century, remarks, with regard to the care of the leprous, that, "owing to the danger of infection, the impatience and the ingratitude of the victims of this disease, it was one of the most forbidding labours to wait upon them. Amongst thousands but very few were to be found who could be induced to live with them; for with many, nature itself revolts at it. And had there not been some who, for God's sake, fought down the repugnance of nature, they would have been left absolutely deprived of all human assistance."† Jacob of Vitry ‡ says, concerning the persons who devoted their lives to this arduous work of Christian charity: "For Christ's sake they bring themselves to endure, amidst filth and disgusting scents,—by driving themselves up to it,—such intolerable hardships, that it would seem as if no sort of penitential exercise which man imposes

*computrescentes ex his membris instar carbonum nigrescentibus aut miserabiliter moriuntur aut manibus ac pedibus putrefactis truncati miserabiliore vite reservantur, multi nervorum contractione distorti tormentantur.*

\* See the Collections, at the 17th January, in the *Actis Sanctorum*.

† See the work of Humbertus de Romanis de *eruditione prædicatorum*, c. xli. *Bibl. patr. Lugd. T. XXV. f. 476.*

See p. 81.

on himself deserved a moment to be compared with this holy martyrdom,—holy and precious in the sight of God.”\* Female societies, having the same object in view, were also formed.

But that which began in the spirit of a Christian charity that shrunk from no sacrifice, was, like so many other noble undertakings, imitated and abused in the thirteenth century by a worldly spirit that masked itself under the seemly guise of religion. Jacob of Vitry was forced to make the bitter complaint that many who pretended to devote their lives to this nursing of the sick, only used it as a cover under which to exact, by various and deceptive tricks from the abused sympathies of Christians, large sums of money, of which but a trifling portion was expended on the objects for which it had been bestowed.† Pope Innocent the Second passed an ordinance against such fraudulent collectors of alms for Spitals.‡

Among the foundations for benevolent purposes is to be reckoned the order of *Trinitarians*. John of Matha, a Parisian theologian, but a native of Provence, and Felix de Valois, after living for some time as anchorets at Certroy, in the province of Meaux, joined together and founded a society of monks, the principal object of which was to procure the redemption of Christians who had fallen captive to the infidels.§ In the year 1198 they submitted their plan to pope Innocent the Third, who ratified it. The society subsisting under one superior (*generalis minister*) was to be consecrated to the Trinity (*Fratres domus sanctæ trinitatis*), and a third part of their revenues was to be appropriated to the redemption of Christians held in bondage amongst infidels on account of their faith.||

Down to the thirteenth century the different orders of monks had multiplied to such an extent that pope Innocent the Third was induced, at the Lateran council in 1215, to enact a law to the following effect: “Whereas the excessive diversity of these institutions begets confusion, no new foundations of this sort must be formed for the future; but whoever wishes to become a monk must attach himself to some one of the already

\* See Hist. occidental. p. 338. † L. c. p. 339. ‡ See epp. Lib. I. ep. 450.

§ The accounts collected in Du Boulay, Hist. univers. Paris, T. II. f. 524.

|| Ad redemptionem captivorum, qui sunt incarcerationati pro fide Christi a paganis. Epp. Lib. I. ep. 481.

existing rules.”\* And yet it was but shortly after this time that the two monastic orders were constituted which exercised by far the most powerful and most widely diffused influence; to wit, the two mendicant orders of the Dominicans and the Franciscans. In these two foundations, especially in the latter, we may observe the renascent power of that idea of following Christ and the apostles in evangelical poverty, and the absolute renunciation of all earthly goods, which from the times of the twelfth century we saw coming up under various shapes, in the doctrine of Arnold of Brescia, in the prophecies of the abbot Joachim. It could easily come about, indeed, that from this idea a tendency might spring up hostile to the dominant church, but it might also give rise to such spiritual societies as would devote themselves to the service of the church; for, according to the idea of the Catholic church at its present stage, points of view and modes of life in the greatest variety, and even opposed to one another, might subsist together, one supplying the other's defects, and the church unite all these antagonisms together in a higher unity; they would become heretical only then, when one of these tendencies came to exclude all the others, and to set up itself as the only right one. Thus, after the same manner as the married life, the family, subsisted side by side with the unmarried life as a higher stage of Christian perfection, those religious societies that renounced all worldly possessions and property might be tolerated and favoured beside the splendour of the papacy and of the hierarchy. The founder of the order of Dominicans was born in the year 1170, at Calarugna, a village in the diocese of Osma in Castile. Even while a young man, pursuing his studies at the Spanish university in Palenza, he was distinguished for his self-sacrificing Christian love. In a time of great famine, he sold his books and furniture, in order to provide himself with the means of mitigating the sufferings of the poor, and by his example he excited many to do the same. Didacus, bishop of Osma, was a man of severe character, and ardently devoted to the good of the church. He sought

\* In the thirteenth canon of the fourth Lateran council of the year 1215: *Ne nimia religionum diversitas gravem in ecclesia Dei confusionem inducat, firmiter prohibemus, ne quis de cætero novam religionem inveniatur, sed quicunque voluerit ad religionem converti, unam de approbatis assumat.*

to bring back his canonical clergy to the strictness of the ancient rule, and similarity of disposition united him with Dominick, whom he received into this body. A journey which he made with him in the service of his king to the south of France, gave both an opportunity of observing the great danger which there threatened the church from those heretical sects which were spreading with great rapidity, and they were excited by what they saw to direct all their attention and their energies to this one point. In the year 1208 they came, for the second time, into these regions, after pope Innocent the Third had despatched twelve Cistercian abbots, under the direction of the papal legate, to put down the sects. A council was held at Montpellier, to deliberate on this matter, and bishop Didacus was invited to assist at it. When the latter observed the great state affected by the papal legate, and others who had been sent on this errand, he told them they could hardly succeed in this way to oppose any effectual check to the heretics; they would come off still more triumphantly in their attacks on the church, and point to all this pomp as evidence of the truth of what they had said about the worldly lives of the clergy; they would compare their own strict and abstemious mode of living in utter poverty, as the true followers of Christ and the apostles, with the splendour and luxury that surrounded those who stood up for the interests of the dominant church, and thus gain the popular feeling over to their side. He invited them to take the opposite course, to renounce all state, and by a strict and needy life place themselves on an equality with the persons extolled in those sects; thus would they accomplish more by their living than they could do by their words. His advice was adopted, and everything that could be spared sent away. Bishop Didacus was intrusted with the direction of the whole movement, and travelling on foot in voluntary poverty, they went from place to place preaching and disputing with the sects. After having laboured in this way for three years, this bishop set out on his return to Spain. It was his intention to recommend to the pope the appointment of a certain number of men who should labour for the conversion of the sects; but his death, which took place on his journey homeward, in the year 1206 or 1207,\*

\* The death of bishop Didacus, according to the life of Dominicus, by his disciple Jordanus, the second general of this order (the authority

prevented him from carrying his plan into execution, and it remained for Dominick, to whom no doubt the experience which he gained in these tours had suggested the idea of his order, to realize the project which had been conceived by his bishop. The latter, on leaving the south of France, had placed him at the head of the whole spiritual undertaking. After the death of the bishop, however, he retained but few of his companions. When armed troops were called in to follow up the work of preaching and disputing, and, in the year 1209 the horrible crusade against the Albigenes was commenced, Dominick still went on with his labours, and the cruelties resorted to for the extirpation of heresy were approved and promoted by him,—a bad precedent, foretokening already the history of an order which in after times was to exercise such cruel despotism under the name of charity. He found a few still remaining here like-minded with himself, who joined with him in forming a society consecrated to the defence of the church. Several pious men in Toulouse entered heart and hand into his scheme, and placed their property in his hands, to purchase books for the society and provide them with what they needed. Fulco himself, the bishop of Toulouse, favoured the undertaking, and in the year 1215 went in company with Dominick to Rome, for the purpose of obtaining the sanction of pope Innocent the Third to a spiritual society devoted to the office of preaching. True, the canon enacted this very year by the Lateran council, forbidding the institution of any new order of monks,\* stood in the way of a compliance with this demand, but at the same council † it had also been expressed, as an urgent need of the church, that the bishops should procure able men to assist them in the office of preaching and in their pastoral labours. Now the supply of this want—a want so sensibly felt on account of the great

which we here follow), took place ten years before the Lateran council under Innocent the Third, s. 30, Mens. August, T. I. f. 549. A tempore obitus episcopi Oxoniensis usque ad Lateranense consilium anni fluxere ferme decem. If we take this strictly, it would be in the year 1205; but this supposition is attended with other chronological difficulties, and the *ferme* still renders the calculation inexact. It is very difficult to fix here the exact determination of time. See the chronological inquiries in the preliminary remarks to the *Life of Dominicus*, at the 4th August.

\* See above, p. 371.

† See p. 293.

number of ignorant and worldly-minded clergymen—was the very purpose and aim of the scheme submitted by Dominick to the pope. Innocent, therefore, accepted the proposition, making only one condition, that Dominick should attach himself to some one of the orders of monks already existing. Dominick selected the so-called rule of Augustin, with a few modifications aiming at greater strictness. The order was to accept of no property that needed to be managed, but only the incomes from the same, lest it might be diverted by the cares of secular business from its spiritual vocation. Pope Honorius the Third confirmed the establishment of the order in 1216, and it was styled, in accordance with the object to which it was especially consecrated, *Ordo predicatorum*. In the first chapter of its articles, it was settled that it should hold neither property in funds nor income.\* It is evident from many examples,† that great efforts were made to enlarge and extend the society by energetic preachers amongst its earliest members. Many young men at the universities and in other cities were carried away by the fervent appeals of the preaching friars, and finally devoted themselves to this foundation.

The founder of the second order, Francis, was born at Assisi, in the year 1182. His father, called Peter of Bernardone, was a merchant of some consideration in the above-mentioned city. Devoted to mercantile pursuits, Francis lived at first after the ordinary manner of the world, though even at this time he was remarkable for his susceptibility to religious impressions, and for his benevolent disposition. A severe fit of sickness, which befell him when he was about the age of twenty-four, is said to have left on him a decided impression, which eventuated in an entirely new turn of life. It would be a matter of some importance could we be more exactly informed with regard to the nature of his disease, and the way in which it affected his physical and mental constitution. Perhaps it might assist us to a more satisfactory explanation of the eccentric vein in his life, that singular mixture of religious enthusiasm with a fanaticism bordering on insanity; but we are here left wholly in the dark. After his health was

\* See c. iii. s. 63.

† Which are cited in the *Life of Dominicus*, already mentioned, c. li. and lv.



restored he felt more and more drawn away from earthly things and impelled by an indescribable craving after a divine life. He thought himself admonished by Christ in dreams and visions, and in accordance with his habit at that time, of referring everything to sense, he was inclined to interpret his visions after a sensuous manner, until he was afterwards taught to understand them spiritually. On one occasion, he beheld in a vision or dream a vast palace full of weapons, each having on it a sign of the cross, and inquiring to whom they all belonged, he was answered, "To thee and thy soldiers." Taking this literally, he was already preparing to go and offer his services to a certain noble count, with the expectation of rising to the highest honours in the profession of arms, when another vision held him back. Once, after long roaming about and meditating in the fields, he stepped into an old church falling to ruins, for the purpose of prayer. He prostrated himself in deep devotion before a crucifix, and as he looked up to it with eyes full of tears, he thought he heard thrice coming from it the following words, addressed to himself: "Go, rebuild my house, which, as thou seest, is falling to ruins." These words he understood at first as referring to the restoration of the ruined building where he was, and he set about procuring money to repair it, though long afterwards they were interpreted by himself and his followers as referring to the spiritual renovation of the church.\* The change which he had experienced and the extravagant austerities to which he subjected himself, caused him at first to be ridiculed as a madman; but as he could not be induced to swerve from his purpose, or alter his mode of life by any ridicule or any insult, as in truth there was something in him too exalted for ridicule, and capable of attracting more profound and earnest minds, so it was certain that he must come off victorious in the end. It was an age in which the exaggerated and caricature-like, if it only had at bottom some profound idea harmonizing with the tone of many minds, would be more certain to further than to check the influence of the individual who possessed it. Like many of his times, he united with a deep mystical element a

\* Bonaventura, in his *Life of St. Francis*, c. ii.: *Licet principalior intentio verbi ad eam ferretur (ecclesiam), quam Christus sanguine suo acquisivit, sicut eum Spiritus sanctus edocuit et ipse postmodum fratribus revelavit.*

religious tendency that clung to the outward, for which tendency this outward itself became transformed through reference to this mystical element just spoken of into something that savoured of the magical. Thus, for example, he regarded churches with a peculiar sort of veneration, and exerted all the powers of his heart-stirring eloquence in making collections for the purpose of rebuilding such as were falling to decay. Among these churches may be noticed particularly the church dedicated to Mary, at Portiuncula. This was his favourite place of abode, where he loved to give himself up to prayer and religious contemplation, and it afterwards arose to great consequence among this order. Once, while attending mass, he heard recited the words of Christ to the apostles, when he first sent them forth: "Provide neither gold nor silver," &c., Matth. x. 9, 10. He took it as a voice from heaven addressed to himself. This was the idea of evangelical poverty which had already vaguely floated before his mind; and, assuming the dress described in Christ's direction, he from that moment travelled about preaching repentance, and one by one gathered around him several followers.

When Francis, in the year 1210, first presented himself before pope Innocent the Third, for the purpose of submitting to him his rule, drawn, as he thought, after the pattern of the apostolic mode of life, he is said to have met with an unfavourable reception. The pope, who was walking in his palace, plunged in thought, regarding him as unworthy of notice, motioned him away with contempt; but he was led, as it is said, by a vision which he had at night, to entertain a different opinion of the man. We know not what foundation of truth there may be for this story. Even if it were true that Innocent paid him but little notice at first, troubled as he no doubt too often was by the rude importunity of many of similar pretensions, still, the penetrating glance of this great man would not be long in discovering of itself to what valuable purpose such an enthusiasm might be turned, if taken into the service of the church, so hard pressed in these times by the sects. Such an idea,—the idea of a society of spiritual paupers, placed alongside that of a church doing homage to worldly power and glory,—might command respect, even from him; and he was taught by the example of the Waldenses,\* how

\* Of whom we shall speak in the 4th sect.

easily the enthusiasm for such an idea, if it did not attach itself to the church, might give birth to a tendency in opposition to the church. It admits of a question, too, whether the report is a true one, that the rule of Francis met at the beginning with much opposition from several of the cardinals, on the ground that it seemed an unheard-of thing, a project surpassing the powers of man; till another cardinal observed, If the observance of evangelical perfection is held to be a thing unheard of, impracticable, and unreasonable, such an opinion is a calumny against the gospel and the author of it, Christ himself. We may understand, at least from the language attributed to this cardinal, in what way this age represented to itself the ideal of following after Christ.

The zealous striving after perfect purity of heart,\* impelled Francis, impatient at every motion of sinful lust which he discerned in himself, to every sort of mortification by which he could hope to subject the body entirely to his higher aspirations. The meditation on every such stirring of ungodly impulses, brought him perhaps into contact with various temptations; and his imagination pictured it out into a conflict with evil spirits. It is singular to observe how the power of truth in his own consciousness testified against himself. Once, when engaged at night in prayer, he thought he heard a voice saying to him—"There is not a sinner in the world whom God would not forgive, if he turned to him; but he who destroys himself by severe exercises of penance, will never find mercy."† This was an admonition of the Holy Spirit; just as when, once, he was thinking over with pain some of the scenes of his earlier life, the assurance of the forgiveness of all his sins was given him, and joy filled his heart, so that, resigning himself to the objective grace,‡ he is said to have desisted from further self-mortification. But now the voice of the Holy Spirit appeared to him as a voice of some wicked spirit. Yet, in the labour and constant activity which he recommended to his disciples, he recognized an important

\* As it is expressed in the words of Francis: *Tolerabilius viro spiritali fore, magnum sustinere frigus in carne, quam ardorem carnalis libidinis vel modicum sentire in mente.*

† Bonaventura, c. v.

‡ L. c. c. iii.

means for preventing inward temptations, and likewise the waste of time in unprofitable talk.\*

He himself, however, at a later period of life, attributed no value to self-mortification, in itself considered, but regarded it solely as a means for overcoming sensual desires, and for promoting purity of heart. Love appeared to him to be the soul of all. Once, when one of the monks who had carried his fasting to excess, was deprived by it of his sleep, and Francis perceived it, he brought him bread with his own hands, and exhorted him to eat; and as the monk still shrunk from touching it, he set him the example and ate first. On the next morning, when he assembled his monks, he told them what he had done, and added—"Take not the eating, but the love, my brethren, for your example." Later in life, he did not shrink from preaching before the pope and the cardinals. "His words," says Bonaventura, "penetrated like glowing fire to the inmost depths of the heart." Once, when he was to preach before the Roman court, for which occasion he had committed to memory a carefully written discourse, he felt all of a sudden as if he had forgotten the whole, so that he had not a word to say. But after he had openly avowed what had occurred to him, and invoked the grace of the Holy Spirit, he found utterance for words full of power, which produced a wonderful effect on all present.† Zeal to promulgate the gospel, perhaps also a fanatical striving after martyrdom, prompted him to resolve on making a voyage to Morocco; but he was prevented from executing this purpose by sickness. Respecting his missionary efforts amongst the Saracens, we have already spoken on a former page.‡

The spirit which, in spite of all his fanaticism, animated and inspired this man, which enabled him to exert so profound an influence on so many minds, and to attract to him men of such importance as Bonaventura,—this spirit discovers itself to us in many of his sayings. He constantly taught that a heart fixed on God is all that gives actions their real importance. In showing how men ought to despise the outside show of holiness, said he, "A man is just so much and no more, as

\* His words: *Volo fratres meos laborare et exercitari, ne otio dediti per illicita corde aut lingua vagentur.* L. c. c. v.

† Bonaventura, f. 294.

‡ See p. 80.

he is in the sight of God.”\* “No one,” he often repeated to his monks, “should value himself for that which the sinner can do as well. The sinner can fast, pray, weep, and chastise his body; but there is one thing he cannot do, he cannot be faithful to his Lord. This alone, then, is our true glory, when we give to the Lord *his* glory; when we serve him faithfully, and ascribe all to him which he bestows on us.”† He was in some sort at strife with himself, as he told his monks, on the question whether he ought to devote himself to prayer alone, or also to busy himself with preaching. He thought that as he was a simple, uneducated man, he had received a greater gift of prayer than of preaching. “By prayer,” said he, “one improves himself in gifts of grace; by preaching, one communicates the heavenly gifts received to others. Prayer tends to purify the affections of the heart, and to produce a union with the true and highest good, and an increase of moral strength; but preaching leads to a dissipation of the thoughts on outward things. Finally, in prayer we discourse with God, and hear his voice, and, as companions of the angels, live an angel-like life; in preaching, we must let ourselves down a good deal to men, live among them like men,—think, see, discourse, and hear like men. But one consideration seemed to him to outweigh all the rest, and to turn the scale; and this was, that the Son of God came down from heaven in order to form, by his example, the men whom he would redeem, and to preach to them the word of salvation, reserving nothing to himself which he was not ready to give up for our salvation. And as we should copy his example in all things, so it seems more acceptable in the sight of God that we should renounce rest, and go forth to work.”‡ Accordingly, he declares the activity expended in seeking to win souls to God more precious to him, if it proceeds from true love, than any offering. But that preacher is to be pitied who seeks not the salvation of souls, but his own glory; or who destroys by a wicked life what he builds up by the setting forth of pure doctrine. To such a person the simple Christian is greatly to be preferred who lacks the gift of discourse, and

\* Quantum homo est in oculis Dei, tantum est et non plus. Bonaventura, c. vi

† L. c. f. 283.

‡ Bonaventura, c. xii.

yet, by his own good example, promotes the cause of goodness.\* He warned his monks against overvaluing their own powers when they thought they saw great success attending their preaching. He spoke of those who, when they saw that some had been edified or awakened to repentance by their discourses, prided themselves upon it as their own work, when perhaps they were only instruments of others, living in secret, who had wrought these effects by their prayers.† “Blessed,” said he, “is that servant who no more values himself on that which God speaks or works through him, than he does on that which God speaks or works through another.”‡ To the vicar of his order, Elias, he wrote:—“There is only one mark by which I can know whether thou art a servant of God; namely, if thou compassionately bringest back wandering brethren to God, and never ceaseest to love those who grievously err.”§ He particularly recommended to his brethren itinerating through the world not to contend; not to judge others; to be meek, peace-loving, and humble.|| He admonished them not to despise others who lived in better style, and went better dressed. “*Our God*,” said he, “is also their Master, and he is able to call them to himself and to justify them.”¶ Moreover, he warned his monks against excessive asceticism. “Each should consider his own nature; and if one required a less quantity of food, another, who required more, ought not to imitate him in that; but, having regard to his own nature, he should give his body just what it needed. For, as we ought to be on our guard against a superfluity which is injurious both to soul and body, so, and still more, ought we to be cautious of excessive abstinence, since God will have mercy and not sacrifice.”\*\* “We are called to this,” said he to his monks, “that we should heal the wounded and reclaim the wandering, for many who seem to you members of the devil will still be disciples of Christ.”†† A characteristic trait in Francis, growing out of that blending of the mystical element with the sensuous, of which we have spoken, was his reverence for every outward thing that

\* L. c. c. viii. f. 286.

† L. c. c. xvi. f. 325.

‡ Opusc. ed. Wadding. T. I. c. xvii. p. 77. § L. c. T. I. p. 20.

|| L. c. T. II. p. 172.

¶ L. c. T. III. p. 288.

\*\* L. c. p. 306.

†† L. c. p. 341.

struck him as ennobled by its reference to religion; for the clergy, for churches, and especially for the consecrated bread and wine of the holy supper.\* It was to him a matter of importance to be scrupulously careful that not a leaf on which the name of our Lord was written should be suffered to remain and be profaned in any unclean place, but that every such scrap should receive the due mark of homage. Again, as the ascetic bent admits of being easily converted into a contempt of nature, so we cannot but regard as the more remarkable that love, pushed even to enthusiasm, with which Francis embraced all nature as the creation of God; that sympathy and feeling of relationship with all nature, by virtue of its common derivation from God as Creator, which seems to bear more nearly the impress of the Hindoo than of the Christian religion, leading him to address not only the brutes but even inanimate creatures as brothers and sisters.† He had a compassion for brute animals, especially such as are employed in the sacred Scriptures as symbols of Christ. This bent of fanatical sympathy with nature furnished perhaps a point of entrance for the pantheistic element, which in later times found admission with a party among the Franciscans. As in general the culminating point of the form of Catholicism in that day exhibited itself in this order on a certain side, so from many other of the peculiar ideas which inspired Francis, as the following after Christ, evangelical poverty,—tendencies might proceed forth which were at variance with the church system. Seized and emblazoned in the colours of a sensuous fancy, that profoundly Christian idea of following after Christ gave birth to the story of the five wounds,‡ said to have been imprinted on Francis, after Christ had appeared to him in a miraculous vision, two years before his death in 1226. Eye-witnesses are appealed to who saw these marks at the time. A story, which assuredly did not proceed at first from any intention to deceive,—but only from the *self*-deception of a fanatical bent of the imagination, and from fancied exaggeration; and a story with regard to which it still needs and deserves inquiry to what extent, in certain eccentric states of the system, a morbidly over-excited

\* His words in the *Opusculis*, p. 360: *Sublimitas humilis, quod Dominus universitatis, Deus et Dei filius sic se humiliat, ut pro nostra salute sub modica panis formula se abscondat.*

† E. g., *Mi frater ignis.*

‡ *Quinque stigmata Christi.*

fancy might react on the bodily organism. It cannot be doubted, however, that this story has contributed much to promote a fanatical and excessive reverence of Francis, highly derogatory to the honour which is due to Christ alone.

Three spiritual orders were founded by him. The one already mentioned, and which was the first, avoiding each proud name, called itself the society of minor brothers (*Fratres minores, Minorites*), and its rule, revised, was confirmed by pope Honorius the Third. The second was an order of nuns. This started with a young woman in Assisi,—Clara, whom a kindred bent of Christian feeling, early communicated to her by education,\* conducted to Francis; and she was the first superintendent of the order called after herself, the order of St. Clara (at first, *Ordo dominarum pauperum*). Next came the third order (*Fratres ordinis tertii, tertiarii*), by the founding of which, in the year 1221, Francis furnished an opportunity for pious laymen, who would not or could not renounce the family-life, to live together in a sort of spiritual union, after one rule, and under a superior. They were also called *Fratres Penitentiae*, inasmuch as this monk-like mode of life was regarded as a life devoted to penance. Many pious societies, which had proceeded from the order of laymen, might here find a place of refuge and a common bond of union.

The peculiar regulation that distinguished the orders of the so-called mendicants (*Fratres mendicantes*) from other orders, would serve in a special manner to promote their more extensive spread and more general influence. In order to their establishment in any place, no endowed monasteries were required. Every country, every village, stood open to them; and they were contented with whatever indifferent food might be offered them. The way in which they subsisted brought them into the closest relations with the lower class of people. As religious instruction and the pastoral care were for the reasons already given most neglected in their case, so the monks who interested themselves with self-denying love in their spiritual wants, were received with the more hearty wel-

\* See the account of her life by a contemporary, at the 12th August. Her mother had distinguished herself by the zeal with which she made pilgrimages; she, in fact, undertook a journey to the holy sepulchre, and made it a point to visit all the holy places in Syria.



come ; and, provided only pious men, well-instructed in the doctrines of Christianity, were selected for that purpose, much good might be done by their means. The men, animated by pious zeal, who first, with a sort of enthusiastic love, seized upon this mode of life, subjected themselves to sacrifices and deprivations truly great, when in all weathers, defying the fiercest cold in the north, the fiercest heat in the south, they itinerated through the countries, entering the meanest hovels, and cheerfully putting up with any fare which the poor occupants set before them to satisfy the most pressing momentary wants, and at the same time sustained all the toil of preaching and fatigue of pastoral labours. Nor did they suffer themselves to be driven off by insults and ridicule, whether from laymen, whose utter barbarity of manners and the want of religious instruction made them regard these men as unwelcome guests, or from jealous ecclesiastics. The Belgian Dominican, Thomas de Cantimpre, who lived in the thirteenth century, relating his own experience in this way,\* describes how he and his companions, so wearied out by a long journey which they had made on foot as to be ready to sink to the earth, arrived at a certain village. They went to the house of a parish priest ; but he refused to give them even a morsel of the black bread on which he supported himself and his domestics. After they had wandered over the whole village, and applied in vain at every door, they came finally, near the end of it, to a poor hut, where they were offered a crust of bran-bread,—a very acceptable alms to persons in their condition. They sat down under the sky and regaled themselves on this fare ; and never had food tasted so pleasant to them before as this bran-bread

\* See the words of Thomas Cantipratensis, in his *Bonum universale de apibus*, L. II. c. x.: Numquid primo vides in prædicatorum ordine fratres, qui etsi studiis continuis et vigiliis macerati, non habentes in zona æs, per lutosam et lubricam pedibus gradientes terras prædicationibus circuire, imparata frequenter hospitia, cibos crudos, et duros, et super omnia ingratitudinem hominum sustinere? He relates in the same chapter, p. 164, an example from his own experience: Veni pedes in villam ignotam mihi, longo itinere fatigatus in tantum, ut præ debilitate nimia corde me deficere mox putarem. Ingressi fratres domum presbyteri nec saltem frustum panis nigerrimi, quo familia vescebatur, potuerunt obtinere. Inde digressi late per villam nihil prorsus, nisi in fine villæ a quadam paupercula fragmen panis furfurei habuerunt, donum satis magnum.

mixed with straw. "And not without deep pain," says this man, who, from being a canonical priest at Cantinpre, had turned Dominican, "did I compare myself, who was not able to undergo so much at once in a single day, with those deservedly-called blessed men who, in many places, and in much worse circumstances, are obliged to endure greater hardships than these."

With good reason, if we compare such men with other monks, might it be said of them, that although they pursued no bodily occupation to obtain a subsistence, yet they endured for other purposes far greater labours and deprivations.\* The Benedictine Matthew of Paris, who, being an antagonist to both orders, is certainly an unexceptionable witness, relates how the Franciscans, directly after the establishment of their order, were favoured by pope Innocent the Third; how they settled themselves down in societies of ten or seven in the towns and villages; how on Sundays and festival days they came forth from their seclusion, and preached in the parish churches; how they were contented with anything that was offered to them for the satisfying of their bodily wants; and how they set before all men an example of humility.† By their strict mode of living, their deprivations, their disinterested, indefatigable labours for the salvation of souls, these monks would gain the love and respect of their contemporaries, and so much the more as they were distinguished thereby from the other worldly and degenerate monks of older foundations, who suffered themselves to be carried away by the tide of corruption.‡ Certainly, their efficiency as preachers and pastors

\* See L. c.

† At the year 1207: Sub his diebus prædicatores, qui appellati sunt minores, favente papa Innocentio, subito emergentes terram repleverunt, habitantes in urbibus et civitatibus deni et septeni, nihil omnino possidentes, in victu et vestitu paupertatem nimiam præferentes, nudis pedibus incedentes, maximum humilitatis exemplum omnibus præbuerunt. Diebus autem dominicis et festivis, de suis habitaculis exeuntes, prædicaverunt in ecclesiis parochialibus evangelium verbi, edentes et bibentes quæ apud illos erant, quibus officium prædicationis impendebant. Qui in rerum cœlestium contemplatione tanto perspicaciores sunt inventi, quanto a rebus præsentis sæculi et carnalibus deliciis comprobantur alieni.

‡ Complaints of the licentious manners and rude worldly lives of many among the Benedictines may be found in a letter of Robert of

for the common people had a great influence, and was attended with the happiest results, so long as due care was taken to select the right sort of men for the performance of these duties. It was through the powerful preaching of one of these Franciscans, Dodo of Friesland, who flourished in the first half of the thirteenth century, that a stop was finally put to the practice of taking revenge for bloodshed, which had continued to prevail in that country down to his own times.\* Pious bishops, who were anxious for the salvation of their flocks, sent of their own accord to procure men from these two monkish orders, to take the place of the vicious and ignorant clergy, in the office of preaching and the performance of pastoral duties; but the latter finding that their shameful deficiencies were exposed by these monks, and that the people ran after the new preachers and confessors, became their bitterest enemies. Robert Grosshead, bishop of Lincoln, for example, a prelate sincerely anxious for the spiritual prosperity of his extensive diocese, was inclined to encourage in every way the labours of the mendicant friars among his people. He was obliged to complain that his clergy† resorted to various bad arts, for the purpose of drawing away the people from the new preachers and confessors belonging to the two mendicant orders; whilst others, whose influence was most injurious to piety, but whose spiritual quackery brought gain to their employers, were welcomed into the field.‡ He bade the priests of his diocese take every pains to persuade the people to attend diligently on the preaching of the monks, and to confess to them, but to have nothing more to do with those quacks,—those quæstuarii, or penny-preachers, as the same class of people were called in the sermons of the pious Franciscan,

Lincoln, in the collection already cited on p. 200, ep. 53, p. 343, and ep. 108, p. 382.

\* Thomas Cantipraten. T. I. c. i. p. 120.

† On whom first he had to make requisitions of this sort, ut sciat unusquisque saltem simpliciter articulos fidei et decem mandata. See his address to his clergy, l. c. p. 260.

‡ Sunt quidam rectores et vicarii et sacerdotes, qui non solum audire fastidiunt prædicationes utriusque ordinis, sed sicut possunt, ne audiat eos populus prædicantes aut iis confitentur, malitiose præpediunt, admittunt etiam, ut dicitur, prædicatores quæstuarios ad prædicandum, qui solum talia prædicant, qualia nummum melius extrahunt. See ep. 107. to his archdeacon.

Berthold, in the last times of the thirteenth century.\* He requested the general of the Dominicans to send him an assistant† from his order;‡ since he stood in great need of help, his diocese being large, and more populous than any other in England. It was his desire that the archbishop of Canterbury might have men around him that were not only versed in the civil and canon laws, but that had also studied divine wisdom in the sacred oracles, and received it not merely into their minds, but also into their hearts, and bore testimony of it by their daily walk; but such men were to be found only in the two orders.§ So agreeable to his views were the renunciation of everything earthly, and the zeal for the salvation of souls in those two orders; so much did he hope from them as a means of good to the church, that he is said to have seriously entertained the idea of entering into one of the orders himself. At a synod held at Cologne, under the papal legate, Conrad, a parish priest complained of the encroachments of the Dominicans, who, under the

\* In the letter just referred to. Among the treasures of the cathedral library of Prague, a rich and important collection for everything pertaining to church history, are to be found many other manuscript letters of the bishop of Lincoln, serving to illustrate this point, which are not contained in the collection published by Brown. In a letter to the pope, in which he laments over the corruption of the church and the great want of religious instruction, he mentions the Dominicans as shining conspicuously above all others throughout the whole land, luce prædicationis. Ep. 6. In a letter to the cardinal de Ostia (ep. 7), he says: *Fratres Minoritæ per Angliam constituti sua salubri prædicatione populum efficaciter illuminant ad veritatem.* In a letter to a bishop, in which he advocates the cause of the injured mendicant friars, he says of them: *Verbo prædicationis et exemplo populum illuminant et suppleant in hac parte defectum prælatorum.* During a short residence in Prague, in the year 1817, when, by the distinguished kindness and liberality of a very worthy man, whom I hold in grateful remembrance, the late archdeacon Pallas, I was allowed the privilege of consulting these treasures with the utmost freedom, I took these notes. May the example of that excellent person, in allowing men of letters the freest access to those valuable treasures, shine forth as a light to all that come after him.

† See above, p. 287.

‡ *Ideo nos pluri et efficaciore indigemus auxilio in verbi Dei prædicatione, confessionum auditione, penitentiarum injunctione, prudentiori quoque consilio in variorum et novorum casuum quotidie emergentium secundum scripturarum intelligentiam sana et salubri determinatione nec novimus tam efficacem in hac parte coadjutorem quam fratrem, etc.* Ep. 40, p. 334.

§ See ep. 114, p. 388, and Matthew of Paris, at the year 1247, f. 630.

characters of confessors, had contrived to win the favour of the people, and to monopolize everything to themselves. The legate upon this asked him how large his congregation was; and being told that it consisted of nine thousand souls, he severely rebuked the man who was willing to undertake alone the responsibility of caring for so many souls, and did not rather rejoice to find men who were willing to assist him gratuitously in his formidable work.\*

But the greater the influence exercised by the mendicant friars, as preachers and confessors, and as persons who mixed familiarly with all classes, upon the people, so much the more pernicious would it prove when it came to be abused by ignorant and badly disposed men; and of such there would be no want as the branches of these orders extended and multiplied. The causes that had introduced corruption amongst the other monkish societies, as soon as they attained to eminence, were not inactive in the case of these; and soon many evils began to intermingle with the benefits which flowed from them. As they enjoyed the special favour of the popes, and, through their respective generals in Rome, stood in close relations with the popes, they allowed themselves to be employed by the latter as instruments for exacting money, and for other bad purposes. The historian Matthew of Paris, who had himself perceived and extolled the good influences of these foundations at the time of their first appearance, complains of the change which had taken place in the same monks after the lapse of a few years; how they erected sumptuous buildings, and though it was against their wishes, yet consented to be employed by the popes for exacting contributions.† If we may credit him, Robert, bishop of Lincoln, who had hoped so much good from them, denounced them shortly before his death, because his expectations had in so many respects been disappointed.‡ Men had occasion to complain of the obtrusiveness of these monks, of the tricks to which they resorted in order to slip into monasteries, and there fix themselves, after they had once been voluntarily received as guests. It was said that they sought

\* See Thomas Cantimpraten. L. I. c. ix. p. 39.

† Papa de ipsis, licet invitis, suos fecit telonarios et multiformes pecuniarum exactores. At the year 1250, f. 696; comp. the year 1234, f. 339.

‡ See Matthew of Paris, year 1253, f. 752.

to elevate themselves at the expense of all other monks and ecclesiastics; that they took pains to represent their order as the only holy one; that they bound the people exclusively to themselves; and endeavoured to instil into them distrust of their clergy, who, to be sure, often furnished occasion enough for it. Easily might the people be carried so far as to regard all other confessors—and among the clergy there were but too many whose lives were altogether scandalous—as worthless, and to run after these monks alone.\* The enormous influence of these orders threatened to overrun the whole previous constitution of the church, and to do away the various gradations and intermediate links between the pope and the other parts of which the church was composed.†

Partly by the force of the idea lying at the bottom of these two orders, and having its deeper ground in the pious spirit of the age,—partly by the authority which individual preachers exercised over the minds of men, the minds of the youth were especially carried away. Young men of every rank entered, sometimes,—as in the case of the far-famed Thomas Aquinas, contrary to the will of their parents, into one of these orders. Such as had been brought up in a luxurious manner were, by enthusiasm for the church and for the salvation of souls, rendered capable of enduring the greatest hardships.‡ This influence on the youth threatened to spread still more widely; even at the universities it seemed to be constantly on the increase. One of the main directions of spirit in the thirteenth century—the scientific speculative spirit, penetrated and imbued with religious feeling—was powerfully influenced by the

\* See Matthew of Paris, year 1236, f. 354.

† Words of Matthew of Paris, year 1246, f. 608: *Multi præcipue nobiles et nobilium uxores, spretis propriis sacerdotibus et prælatibus, ipsis prædicatoribus confitebantur, unde non mediocriter viluit ordinariarum dignitas et conditio et de tanto sui contemptu non sine magna confusione doluerunt nec sine evidenti causa, videbant ordinem ecclesie jam enormiter perturbari.* Comp. the documents of evidence furnished by Dr. Gieseler, in the *Studien und Kritiken*, I. 1, an. 1828, s. 809, and onward.

‡ Thomas Cantimpræ, *L. II. c. x. p. 171*: *Vidimus maxime in initio ordinis prædicatorum, vidimus et nunc juvenes inexpertos, delicatos, recentem a sæculo venientes, circuire terras socialiter combinatos inter nocentes innocentes, simplices sicut columbas inter astutissime malignantes, prudenter tamen sicut serpentes in sui custodia ambulantes.*

idea of these two orders. Men of great acuteness and profundity,—destined to be the teachers of their times and of succeeding centuries, proceeded from these orders. By their means, too, a ready entrance was procured for them into the universities; and it was to be feared that they would become masters of all the influence in these establishments; that these great institutions would have to lose their freedom and independence. To be sure, the defenders of these orders could appeal to the fact, that the teachers whom they sent out had attained to such eminence by their superior diligence and zeal,—since they were never drawn aside from their work by worldly amusements,—while the professors from the order of the secular clergy were wont to indulge in various dissipations, and bestowed much less care on their lectures.\*

Moreover, these monks contrived, by fair means or foul, to establish their authority in the families of noblemen and princes, as confessors and pastoral labourers.† Possessing so much influence with the popes—who often chose their secretaries from these orders—and with the potentates of the world,—whom men from the same order frequently served as counsellors and agents,—they were regarded by the other monks and by the clergy with fear, and men took care how they got into quarrel with them.‡ King Louis the ninth of France,—whose piety, though it had a monk-like taint, yet was something more than bare superstition and ceremonial observance,—a piety truly

\* Thomas Cantimpræ, who, we admit, wrote in the interest of his party, but still could hardly be supposed to manufacture what he said out of whole cloth, reports, *L. II. c. x. p. 281*: *Videbant scholares, quod magistri seculares sicut viri divitiarum dormierunt somnum suum, ducebantque in bonis dies suos, et quum vespere multiplicitate ferculorum obruerentur et potuum et postea vigilare non possent, nec studere, et per hoc nihil invenire in manibus, quod profferrent, sequenti mane solemnem diem constituiebant, auditoribus condensis, et sic per ineptas vacationes, quibus sua clerici expendere se dolebant, optato privabantur studio.*

† Bishop Robert of Lincoln is said before his death to have objected to them that, independent of all worldly considerations as they had become, by their renunciation of the world, and therefore in a condition to rebuke wickedness in the mighty ones of the earth, they yet neglected to do so. See Matthew of Paris, at the year 1253, f. 752.

‡ Matthew of Paris, year 1236, f. 354: *In multis cedebant iis religiosi, propter potentum offendiculum. Erant enim magnatum consiliatores et nuncii, etiam domini papæ secretarii, nimis in hoc gratiam sibi sæcularum comparantes.*

penetrated by vital Christianity, by the spirit of Christian love, —promoted, from religious motives, with peculiar zeal, the interests of these two orders of monks. Wherever he heard of zealous preachers, he sent for them to come to him. While residing at Yeres in Provence, he invited to his court a preacher of this class, the Franciscan Hugo, who was creating a great sensation in those parts.\* He must also preach before the king; he did so; and told the king that, if he wanted to enjoy a long life and happy reign, he must practise justice; by the contrary course empires had sunk to ruin, among believers and unbelievers. The king invited him repeatedly to stay with him as long as he remained in Provence; but the pious monk did not wish to be interrupted in his labours amongst the people; he excused himself, and spent only a day at the court.†

The two orders of monks, countenanced and supported by such mighty powers, met with the most violent opposition from the university of Paris, which vindicated against them its ancient freedom. This university formed a society distinguished by its independent spirit, a society which boldly maintained its rights in the contest with popes and monarchs. When she believed these were encroached upon, her teachers were accustomed to suspend their lectures and sermons, and shut themselves up in retirement, which, by reason of the great influence this university exercised on the scientific culture of the times, —when the youth resorted to it from all quarters of the world, made no small impression. This means of defence was also employed by it during the present contests. It seemed at first that the cause of the two orders must succumb; for pope

\* The following words of his last will, addressed to his son, characterise the man :—"The first thing I recommend and prescribe to thee is, that thou shouldst love God with all thy heart, and above all things, for without this no man can be blessed. And take good heed that thou doest nothing which may be displeasing to God; that is, that thou committest no sin, for sooner oughtest thou to be willing to suffer any torture than to allow thyself to be hurried into any mortal sin. If God sendest upon thee misfortune, accept it cheerfully, and thank him for it; consider that thou hast well deserved it, and that everything shall work together to thee for good. If he bestows on thee prosperity, thank him with all humility, and take care that thou dost not from pride, or in any other way, become the worse for it."

† This is stated by Joinville, in the *Mémoires*, ed. Petitot, T. II. p. 384.



Innocent the Fourth, moved by the complaints that came to him from all sides of the progress of the mendicants at the expense of the old ecclesiastical order, of the infringements on the rights of bishops and parish priests and the interruption of their labours, issued a bull, in the year 1254, designed to protect the latter in their rights, and to set limits to the all-absorbing influence of the mendicant friars. He thereby drew upon himself the hatred of the latter, who interpreted his death,\* which followed shortly afterwards, as a divine punishment, and who felt strong because they could rely upon the help of more than one monarch.† So much the more favourable to the mendicant friars was Innocent's successor, Alexander the Fourth, who issued several bulls, deciding in their favour against the Parisian university, where they continually sought to extend their influence and to monopolize more places. The rights of this university were at that time defended by a man of great firmness and resolution, possessed of a strongly marked individuality of character, and a clear understanding,—the Parisian Canonius and Doctor of Theology, William of St. Amour (Gulielmus de Sancto Amore).‡ In direct opposition to the mystico-speculative tendency, represented by the more important theologians of the two orders of monks, clearness of understanding constituted with him the predominant quality. In a writing composed A.D. 1255, "*De periculis novissimorum temporum*," he described those monks, without naming them,

\* Thomas Cantipratenus characteristically remarks: Eadem die paralyti percussus obmutuit nec unquam postea invaluit aut surrexit. Qui etiam a quodam sanctissimo viro extra muros orbis Romæ manifestissime visus est mortuus dari sanctis Dei Francisco atque Dominico judicandus. L. c. L. II. c. x. s. 21, p. 174. Compare the altogether different manner in which the free-spirited English Benedictine, Matthew of Paris, judged concerning the death of this pope. See page 259.

† Thomas Cantipratenus says: "The princes, when they heard of a hostile bull which was about to be fulminated by this pope against these two orders, swore that they would seize the possessions and revenues of the secular clergy if the pope meant to destroy the two orders: 'for,' said they, 'these orders have been given as a special blessing to the world, by virtue of the instruction they communicate and the example they furnish to it,'" c. x. p. 174. The zealous defender and the fiercest opponent of the two monastic orders agree together, when William de St. Amour says of the Benedictines: Principes illis favorabiliores provocant contra illos, qui eos non recipiunt aut quos odiant.

‡ So called from his native city, then belonging to Burgundy.

as the precursors of antichrist, as mock-saints and hypocrites, who, by various wicked arts, sought to bring all influence in the church under their own control. What is said in the gospels concerning the pharisees, and in the pastoral epistles concerning the false teachers of the last times, he applies to them. The same points he set forth in his preaching; and courageously defended, in conversation and in letters, what he had asserted in that book.

The entire mode of life followed by these monks, he represented as one opposed to the spirit and essence of Christianity. He brought against them the precept given by the apostle Paul, in the first epistle to the Thessalonians, that every man should support himself by the labour of his own hands. He who would gain his livelihood by begging, is beguiled thereby into flattering, calumniating, and lying. When the mendicant friars maintained that, in following Christ, they strove to reach the highest perfection, he replied: "It is a work of perfection, for *Christ's sake*, to leave all and follow him, in the sense of imitating him in good works. Christ invited men, Luke xviii. 22 (the passage usually quoted in support of the *consilium evangelicum* of poverty), to follow him in doing that which is good, not by begging, for this is a thing forbidden by the apostle Paul. He who has renounced all earthly goods in order to strive after perfection, must either support himself by the labour of his own hands or seek his maintenance in a monastery. Christ and his apostles never begged; Christ carried about a purse with him; he and his apostles had women with them, who provided for their bodily wants. The apostles gained their subsistence by working at their trades, and received freewill offerings only from those to whom they preached the gospel." He does not hesitate to declare, that although this mode of life, which was really at variance with the gospel, had been erroneously confirmed by the church, yet this judgment of the church should be revoked after the truth became known, for even the judgment of the Romish church was liable to correction.\* He appeals to the authority of the Lateran council of 1215, and to its interdict against the multiplication of monkish orders, quoted on a former page.† "Yet why, after the promulgation of this law, have

so many new foundations of this kind sprung up, unless—which far be it from us to say—this council erred in enacting such a law?”\* He not obscurely charges those monks with pharisaical arrogance, when they appropriated the name *religio*, a name which it was customary in the thirteenth century to give to monasticism, to their mode of life; and he applies to them the saying of Christ (Matthew xxiii. 15), with regard to the proselyting spirit of the pharisees; objecting to them, that persons, who before had lived in simplicity, if they were persuaded to embrace their so-called religion, turned at once into arrant hypocrites. Among the artifices by which they sought to increase their influence, he reckons those in particular by which they endeavoured to draw over to their side young men of fine parts at the universities.† As they exercised so great an influence by their preaching, he attacked them also on that score, accusing them of having obtruded themselves uninvited into the calling of preachers and pastors; of seeking only to make a display of their eloquence, their penetration, and their learning, but caring little about that which might minister to salvation.‡ He objected to them, that after having procured canonization for men belonging to their order, they resorted to all possible means of glorifying their festivals, extolled their miracles above those of the ancient martyrs and of the apostles, and even boasted of spurious miracles; that they contrived, by auricular confession, to make themselves acquainted with all the particular and personal relations of individuals, and then availed themselves of this knowledge to sway the minds of men, and to draw them off from their ecclesiastical superiors.§

It deserves to be noticed, that he hints at the possibility of a schism of the church, to be brought about by their means. If once the prelates should perceive it to be necessary to resist their encroachments and their overgrown authority, they might easily be tempted to go to the length of renouncing

\* *Secta sua, quam religionem appellant*, c. xiv.

† *Plerumque circumueunt universitates, in quibus iuvenes ingeniosi et subtiles valeant inveniri, quibus inventis circumueunt illos verbis compositis, commendantes suum statum et suas traditiones*, l. 319.

‡ *Non ea quærentes quæ ad salutem suam et aliorum proficiant, sed ex quibus singulariter eruditi apparent*, p. 395.

§ *Cujuslibet proprietates per confessiones rimando et sic populum multipliciter sibi alliciendo et a suorum prælatorum et doctorum veracium doctrina et consiliis avertendo*, p. 208.

obedience to them; and the consequence would be, that men would also renounce obedience to the Roman see, and the unity of the church being thus broken up, the way would be prepared for the coming of antichrist.\* It is worthy of notice again, that he foretells how, as opponents of the secularization of the clergy, as defenders of humility in the appearance of the church, they would incite the monarchs to deprive the church of all her secular possessions, on the ground that nothing but a purely spiritual jurisdiction belonged to her.† He spoke against a certain pietistic bent, promoted by the influence of these monks, which led men to look upon a coarse and squalid dress as a mark of humility. He maintained, on the contrary, that one might wear even sumptuous apparel, were it but appropriate to the station of the individual and to the customs of the land, and not subservient to pride; ‡ and that pride may go in the dress of a beggar as well as in costly robes. Pride in a beggarly garb was so much the worse, because it carried hypocrisy along with it, which he proved by quoting Matthew vi. 16.§ Nor did he hesitate to attack the direction which had been given by the influence of the mendicant friars to the piety of king Louis the Ninth. He said, among other things, in one of his sermons, that it behoved kings|| to clothe themselves in a manner corresponding to their exalted station, since this was requisite in order to main-

\* Page 289.

† Sub eo etiam prætextu, quod sint humilitatis ecclesiæ zelatores laudant et justificant principes sæculares, temporalem ecclesiæ jurisdictionem coarctantes, dicentes scilicet ac persuadentes dictis principibus, quod ecclesiæ non debet habere jurisdictionem temporalem, ut sic ad eos facilius recursum habeant in suis negotiis, p. 419.

‡ He was charged with asserting, Quod pretiositas vestium non nocet vel juvat ad sæculum. But he declared that he had expressed himself as follows: Quod licet uti veste pretiosa, dum tamen non excedat homo vel mulier modulum personæ suæ vel mores provincie, vel non hoc faciat causa moveendæ concupiscentiæ. § Page 125.

|| King Louis the Ninth declared himself opposed to superfluity of ornament in dress, and said that the money expended in this way had better be given to the poor. See his life by Gottfried of Beaulieu, in Du Chesne, Script. hist. France, T. V. f. 447. It was his wish to wear on Friday and several other days, for penance, a hair shirt (*cilicium*), next his body; but his own confessor told him that such penance was not befitting a person in his station; he ought rather to be bountiful in bestowing alms, and to be strict in administering justice to his subjects. L. c. f. 451. Yet Joinville, in his Memoirs, cites a principle set forth by this

tain their royal dignity. It was not required of them that they should hear many masses every day,\* or that they should attend early mass; but that they should dispense justice, and faithfully fulfil their calling. To put down the party of the Papellardi,† (a term equivalent to canthers, pietists, in later times,) among whom Louis the Ninth was reckoned by worldly-minded people and the opponents of monkish piety,‡ he employed the following singular argument: “Were it a sin to wear, under befitting circumstances, a costly garment, Christ would not have worn that seamless coat (John xix. 23), which in relation to his poverty must have been costly enough.”§ Accordingly he warned men against that false humility which is assumed for appearance sake; and is said to have remarked in one of his sermons, || “Were one now to put on so costly a garment, the Papellardi would spit at him, as the Pharisees spat in the face of our Lord Jesus Christ, when so clad.” And since the idea which lay at bottom of the orders of the mendicant friars was an idea widely prevailing; since there were, indeed, a number of societies of laymen, men and women, who had associated for the purpose of engaging in a similar mode of life; and

monarch: *Que l'on se doit vestir en telle manière et porter selon son estat, que les prudes du monde ne puissent dire: vous en faites trop, n'aussi les jeunes gens: vous en fa tes peu.* Ed. Petitot, p. 175.

\* King Louis heard daily two, frequently three or four masses. To the nobles, who murmured at this, he said, “If he only would spend the same amount of time in throwing dice or in hunting in the forest, nobody would have a word to object. See Gottfried de Beaulieu, l. c. f. 456. William de St. Amour is doubtless referred to in what Thomas Cantipratenus says (see page 385), in his *Bonum Universale*, L. II. c. lvii. s. 64, p. 588: *Erubescat theologicæ cathedræ vilis ille præsumptor, qui prædicavit, ipsum, de quo scripsimus regem, non debere communibus uti vestibus sed semper purpuratum incedere, nec plures missas audire, quam unam. Mortaliter autem peccare dicebat omnes illos, qui dictum regem inducerent ad hujusmodi devotionis et humilitatis exemplum.*

† The name denotes, etymologically, a person wholly devoted to the popes, the parsons, the clergy. The Papellardi were, in the thirteenth century, most directly opposed to the people of the world, *Mundanis*.

‡ *Rex papellardus.* Vid. Thomas Cantipraten. L. c. s. 63. It is related that the Dominicans almost persuaded the king to consent to be admitted into their order; vid. Richerii *Chronicon Senonense*, L. IV. c. xxxvii. D'Achery, *Spicileg.* T. II. f. 645. § Page 132.

|| Yet it is not affirmed that he expressed himself in precisely these words.

since it was the custom to call the persons thus associated, praying brethren (*beghardi*) and praying sisters (*beguina*, *begutta*), William of St. Amour could say, in defence of himself, that “the mendicant friars had no right to regard his strictures on the pietistic bent that belonged amongst the dangers of the last times, as an attack upon their particular mode of life,—which had been approved by the apostolic see; for in truth all his remarks applied to those pious associations which rested upon no such high authority, but had been attacked from various quarters. He referred particularly to those young men and maidens itinerating about in France, who, under pretence of living only for prayer,\* had really no other object in view than to get rid of work, and live on the alms of the pious.† As he had attacked none of those orders by name which subsisted by authority of the Roman church, so, whoever felt himself hit by what he had remarked in a very general way about uncalled preachers, canters, beggars, and vagabonds, would find that he was accused by nobody but himself.” ‡

The cause of these monastic orders was defended with spirit and ingenuity by distinguished men of their own body; such as Bonaventura, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas; but yet, not without a due share of that sophistry of party feeling, which may be discerned on both sides. Their statements do, on the one hand, really expose the injustice and extravagance of many things said by their antagonists; but, on the other, they are obliged to testify, in spite of themselves, to truth, which bore unfavourably on their own interests.

With the greatest justice the defenders of the mendicant friars could affirm that the bad state of the clergy rendered such kind of assistance as that which was furnished to the

\* Like those more ancient Euchites.

† Propter quosdam juvenes, quos appellant bonos valetos et propter quasdam mulieres juvenes, quas appellant beguinas per totum regnum jam diffusas, qui omnes, cum sint validi ad operandum, parum certe aut nihil volent operari, sed vivere volunt de elemosynis in otio corporali sub pretextu orandi, cum nullius sint religionis per sedem apostolicam approbata, p. 91.

‡ Si qui ergo prædicatores contra se specialiter dicta ex more suscipiuntur, et asserant et ideo ea ferre non possint, sed contra illa quasi ad suam defensionem se præparent et eorum prædicatores impugnent, videntur esse tales, quales supra dictum est, p. 440.

church by their orders, a matter of necessity. Bonaventura maintained, that "because sins within the church were continually on the increase, and the bishops, occupied with external things, could not turn their attention to spiritual affairs; because few shepherds resided with their churches, but the majority committed the guidance of souls to hireling vicars, who were for the most part ignorant, negligent, and impure in their lives,—therefore the pope, on whom devolves the care of the whole church, has called us to the assistance of the clergy and the communities."\* How very necessary it was that preaching and pastoral duties should be intrusted to others besides the parish priests, Thomas Aquinas proves, by referring to the incompetency of many priests, who in a large number of districts were so ignorant as not even to understand the Latin language. "Very few indeed," he said, "had made themselves acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, though a preacher of the divine word should be well instructed in them." Again, many communities were so large that a single parish priest, who did nothing else in his whole life, would find it impossible to hear carefully the confessions of all. Experience teaches, too, that if they had none to confess to but their own parish priests, many would wholly omit it, either from an unwillingness to confess their sins to those with whom they daily associated, or because they looked upon them as their enemies, or for various other reasons. They whose business it was to care for the salvation of souls should be distinguished for their knowledge and their holy lives; and a sufficient number of men of this sort could not be found to provide for the want of the parish priests throughout the entire world; since indeed it was on account of the want of well-informed men that the ordinance of the Lateran council, of the year 1215, that, in all the metropolitan churches, men should be appointed capable of teaching theology, could not be carried into effect by the secular clergy. But by these monks the want was supplied to a much greater extent than had been required by that council; so that, in the words of Isaiah, the land was full of the knowledge of the Lord. Experience plainly showed how much had been accomplished by these

\* See *Determinationes circa regulam S. Francisci* opp. T. VII. ed. I uod. f. 330.

orders, founded for the support of the priests who could not satisfy all demands. In many countries heresy had by their means been extirpated ; many infidels reclaimed to the faith ; many persons in various parts of the world instructed in the law of God ; very many awakened to repentance ; so that if any one ventured to pronounce such establishments unprofitable, it could be clearly made out against him that he envied them on account of the grace which wrought through them, and made himself guilty of sinning against the Holy Ghost.\*

It might now be argued again, in defence of these orders, that if they were designed for the purposes above described, then it became necessary for the members to pursue those studies which were requisite to qualify them for their office ; that, in order to get this education, and fit themselves for discharging the duties of this vocation, they must not be required to support themselves by the labour of their own hands. This, Bonaventura sets forth as follows :—"No one amongst us," says he, "is allowed to be idle, but the sick. Some busy themselves with study, in order to qualify themselves for the business of instructing the faithful ; others, with the performance of divine worship ; others, with the collecting of alms for the support of the community ; others bestow their services, with which they are specially charged, on the sick and the healthy ; those who have learned trades work at them for the benefit of the brethren and of strangers ; others, who are so directed, itinerate in different countries,—since we have nobody else to employ on such missions."† The defenders of these orders concede to William of St. Amour, that many of the bad things censured by him were really to be found in individuals amongst them ; but they complained of the injustice he had done them in accusing the whole for what was the fault only of a few.‡ "That which is bad," says Bonaventura, "swims on the surface, and is easily noticed by every one. True holiness is a hidden thing, and is to be found out only by certain

\* *Contra impugnantes religionem* opusc. xvi. ed. Venet, T. XIX. page 341, et seqq.

† L. c. f. 333.

‡ Ut videlicet, quod ab uno vel duobus geritur, toti religioni imponere præsumant, sicut cum dicunt, quod non sunt cibis sibi apposis contenti, lautiora quærentes, et multa hujusmodi, quæ etiam si ab aliquibus aliquando fiant, nullatenus sunt totali collegio imponenda. Thomas Aquinas, opusc. xvi. p. 410.



marks." \* Thomas Aquinas objects to their opponents, that they took it upon them to judge over the conscience, over the hidden things of the heart, when they accused the monks of seeking after the favour of the world—after their own glory, and not the glory of Christ; and of many such-like things. It was only presumption or envy to judge thus: it was the common resort of such as were disposed to decry and to censure rather than to correct. †

Yet it cannot be denied that these distinguished men betrayed the too strong bias of a predilection for their order when they laboured so much to extenuate grievous faults, of which the members of their order were clearly convicted; arguing that no man in this world can live without sin, 1 John i. 8. ‡ If the monks were eager to be received by the rich; if they intermeddled with matters which did not concern them, in order to secure for themselves a comfortable maintenance; if they sought temporal gain among those for whom they preached,—these were to be regarded as slight failings, for which they ought not to be called sinners, much less false apostles. § Bonaventura, || in defending these orders against the reproach that they fawned on the rich, says: "We ought, certainly, to love all, in the Lord; to long after the salvation of the poor as well as of the rich, and seek to promote it to the utmost of our ability, and in the way most profitable for both. Therefore, if a poor man is better than a rich man, we should love him more; but we must honour the rich man most, notwithstanding; and this for four reasons:—First, because in this world God has placed the rich and mighty above the poor in respect to their worldly circumstances; so that, in

\* L. . f. 336.

† Quod maxime faciunt, qui magis amant clamare et vituperare, quam corrigere et emendare. Opusc. xvi. p. 411.

‡ When Thomas Aquinas brings it as a charge against his opponents, that they peccata levia, quæ etiam in quibuscunque perfectis inveniuntur, quasi gravia exaggerant, he reckons among them, quod querant opulentiora hospitia, in quibus melius procurentur, quod procurent aliena negotia, ut sic mereantur hospitia, quod rapiant bona temporalia illorum, quibus prædicant et alia.

§ Quæ etsi in vitium sonent, non tamen sunt tam gravia, ut pro eis dici possint peccatores, qui hæc committunt, nedum ut pro iis possint dici pseudapostoli.

|| L. c. f. 338.

honouring the rich, we concur with the divine order. Secondly, on account of the weakness of the rich, who would be angry and sin if we refused to pay them such honour—they would oppress us, and other poor people. Thirdly, because more good results from the conversion of a rich man than from that of many poor men—for the converted rich man edifies many by his example; and through him much good may be done and much evil prevented.”\* Justifications of this character serve, perhaps, rather to confirm than to refute many of the objections brought by the Parisian theologian against these two orders.

The unflinching advocate of the university of Paris, who had long defended its rights against the most distinguished men of the mendicant orders before the court of Rome, William of St. Amour, finally had to succumb to the united spiritual and secular powers, which acted under the influence of these monks. His book, ‘*De periculis novissimorum temporum*,’ which, on account of the many remarks it contained, cautiously and forbearingly, indeed, yet freely expressed, against the arbitrary proceedings of the popes, could not make a very favourable impression at the Roman court, was condemned in the year 1255, by pope Alexander the Fourth. He had to resign his post, and was banished from France.† He retired to Burgundy, his native country. With the successor of pope Alexander, Clement the Fourth, he found means of becoming reconciled. He placed in the hands of the latter a revised copy of the work which lay at the foundation of his treatise ‘*On the Dangers of the Last Times*,’ and consisted of a collection of proof-texts from Scripture relating to this subject. He lived beyond the year 1270.‡ Although these contests died away, yet the same spirit of freedom was maintained in the University of Paris, which had offered so determined an opposition to the mendicant friars.

The effect of these fierce assaults on the mendicant orders of monks would be to direct the attention of the well-disposed in

\* L. c. f. 338.

† In a poem belonging to these times, the so-called *Roman de la Rose*, it is said of him:—

Estre bany de ce royaume,  
A tort, comme fut Maître Guillaume  
De St. Amour, qu’hypoërisie  
Fit exiler par grand’ennue.

‡ Du Boulay, *Hist. univers. Paris*, T. III. f. 686.

them to the points in which they had degenerated, and to call forth efforts for reform. Although the pious Bonaventura, when he had to defend his order against its antagonists, was too inclined to play the part of an advocate in palliating many of the abuses, yet he expressed himself in an altogether different manner when he addressed the superiors of the order themselves. He now exhibits himself as the rigid censor, and by his own strictures shows that there was foundation for many of the above-stated charges. When, in the year 1256, he was appointed general of his order, he issued a circular letter\* to the presiding officers of the same in the several provinces, calling upon them in the most urgent manner to do their utmost to remove the abuses which had crept in. "The danger of the times," he writes to them; "the violation of our own consciences; the scandal of worldly people, to whom the order, which should be to them a mirror of holiness, has become an object of contempt and abhorrence;—all urge us to action." He declares to them, that he had examined into the causes by which the splendour of the order had become dimmed, and had found that it was to be traced to the fault of some of its own members. He then proceeds to enumerate several particulars, which had brought the order into bad repute. Cupidity, than which nothing could more directly be opposed to the poverty for which the order had been founded; costly and sumptuous buildings; the monopolizing of funerals and of the drawing up of wills,† a thing which could not fail to create great dissatisfaction amongst the clergy, and particularly the priests. To this list he added the enormous expense occasioned by the itinerant brethren. "For, as they cannot be satisfied with a little," says he, "and, as the love of men has waxen cold, we have all become burdensome, and we shall come to be still more so, if some remedy be not soon

\* *Epistola ad ministros provinciales et custodes*, opp. T. VII. ed. Lugdunens. f. 433.

† See, on this point, the treatise of Gieseler, referred to on page 389. The superstitious considered it a great privilege to be buried among the monks, in some one of their churchyards, a circumstance which the latter knew how to turn to their own advantage. The Benedictine Richer says, in the Chronicle of the Dominicans, already noticed: *Illos, qui eis talia dona conferebant, quod Papa facere non potest, a peccatis rapinarum et usurarum absolvebant et mortuos in cœmeteriis suis solenniter sepeliebant.* *Chronicon Senonense*, L. IV. c. xvi. L. C. f. 634.

applied. Though there are very many whom such accusations do not touch, still the disgrace will come upon all, if the innocent have not courage enough to resist the guilty. So let the ardour of your zeal burn forth; and after you have purified the house of our Father in heaven from those who make it a house of merchandise, let it kindle in all the brethren the fire of prayer and devotion." He recommends it to them especially, in accordance with the rule of Francis, to proceed more cautiously in admitting members into the order, and to limit the number of those to be received. They should allow no man to become a preacher or confessor without a previous rigid examination.\* After the same manner he expresses himself in a special letter to one of the provincial superiors. "In former times, the observance of the evangelical perfection made us universally respected and beloved; but at present, when the multitude give themselves up to their bad passions, and superiors cease to enforce the necessary strictness, it seems that many vices are stealing among us which make this venerable society burdensome and contemptible to the people." He expresses great dissatisfaction with those who, contrary to the rule of Francis, assault the clergy in their sermons before the laity, and only sow scandal, strife, and hatred; with those who injure the pastors by monopolizing to themselves the burial of the dead and the drawing up of wills, and who had thereby made the whole order detested by the clergy.† "It is an abominable falsehood," he declares, "for a man to profess the voluntary adoption of the most extreme poverty, while he is unwilling to suffer want in anything; for a man to be rich inside of the monastery, while outside of it he begs like a pauper. All the brethren should be directed to be careful, and avoid every occasion of giving just cause of complaint to the clergy. It should appear manifest to the whole world, that they were not seeking their own advantage, but simply the winning of souls to Christ."

But even before the death of Francis, there was formed within the order the germ of an inward schism leading to important consequences—the strife between a party who were

\* *Officia prædicationis et confessionis cum multo examine imponatis.*

† *Sepulturarum ac testamentorum litigiosa et avida quædam invasio cum exclusione illorum, ad quos animarum cura spectare dinoscitur, non modicum nos clero toti fecit exosos.*

zealous for the literal observance of the so-called evangelical poverty ; and another, who retained only the appearance of it, but in the splendour of monasteries and churches, as well as in other respects, allowed themselves to depart, in manifold ways, from that original principle. The brother Elias, a disciple of Francis himself, who occasioned great disturbances in the order, stood at the head of this laxer party. In opposition to him stood forth other important men, and in particular the influential Anthony of Padua. Sometimes general of the order, Elias fell and rose by turns, till finally he was cast aside entirely, and turned out of it ; but the quarrel between the two parties in the order still went on. The question was, how to unite any possession whatsoever, necessary for this life, with evangelical poverty. Men resorted to a distinction, by which greater latitude of interpretation could be given to this term. They distinguished between a *right* of property, and the *simple use* of another's property for the satisfaction of the necessary wants of life. As property, the Franciscans should possess nothing ; but the *right* of property in all goods administered by them should be given to the pope.\* Thus arose the two parties of the more strict (*Zelantes, Spirituales*) and the more mild Franciscans. The popes, by their explanations of the Franciscan rule, especially Nicholas the Third, by his bull issued in 1297 (called, from its commencing words, "*Exiit qui seminat*"), favoured the principles of the milder party, and expressly confirmed the distinction above stated. So the fanatical zeal of the Zelantes was fanned into a conflict with the dominant church itself. Add to this, that, as the writings of abbot Joachim had found great acceptance with this order generally, which believed that itself had been predicted in them, so the more zealous party in particular busied themselves a good deal with those writings, and the more, in proportion as they became dissatisfied with the existing state

\* See Bonaventura in the *Determinationes quæstionum circa regulam Francisci*, Qu. XXIV. : Præsul sedis apostolicæ, qui est generalis omnium pauperum ecclesiæ provisor, specialiter nostri ordinis curam habet, omnium mobilia, quæ ordini conferuntur, proprietatem sibi assumit, exceptis his, quorum dominium sibi conferentes retinuerunt et nobis usum earundem rerum solum concedit, ut semper alieno victu et vestitu ac tecto et aliis utensilibus absque proprietatis jure, ex ipsius concessione utamur.

of things, and as their fanatical enthusiasm was excited by opposition. The idea of an ultimate perfection of religious life, of the last times of the kingdom of God, of the age of the Holy Ghost, of the everlasting gospel, was pushed by them to still further extremes; and their extravagant notion of the perfection of a life without property, consecrated to contemplation alone, would lead them into the mistake of regarding the whole appearance and evolution of Christianity, thus far, as only a subordinate thing in comparison with that highest stage of spiritual perfection, for which they were to prepare the way. A spiritual pride of mysticism would be ready to exalt itself above everything positive and objective in religion; and we have already pointed out, on a former page, the point of support which such a tendency might find, in several expressions of the abbot Joachim. Many fanatical tendencies, which appropriated to themselves these ideas, were diffused by the different kinds of Beghards, who found refuge in the third order within the general order of Francis.

But here we stop, intending to reserve the more detailed exhibition of the remarkable facts, which are here merely hinted at, for the Fourth Section of the present history.

## SECTION THIRD.

## CHRISTIAN LIFE AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

To the epochs that mark the commencement of a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit, may be reckoned the opening of the twelfth century; and the after effects of the religious awakening which then began among the Christian nations of the West, extend far into the period now before us. As we observed in individual examples, under the preceding section, the religious life was continually receiving a fresh impulse from influences of various kinds: from the vigorous measures of Gregory the Seventh to promote a reform in the whole church; from the impressions produced on the multitude by the preaching of the crusades; from the effects wrought by distinguished preachers of the clerical, and more especially of the monastic order, who itinerated through the countries, exhorting men to repentance; from the founding of the two orders of mendicant friars. Great susceptibility to religious impressions, as well as great depth and power of religious feeling, manifested themselves by various signs of the times: by the quick and general participation in important enterprises undertaken in the name of religion; by the formation of societies in which the energies of many could be speedily united for accomplishing great works consecrated to religion, such as the erection of magnificent churches;\* by the mighty influ-

\* The zeal with which men of all ranks and ages could unite together in building a church is illustrated by an example belonging to the year 1156, which may be found in the life of the abbot Stephen of Obazine, *L. II. c. xviii*: *Aderat hujus tante ædificationis initiis inestimabilis hominum multitudo diversi generis atque ætatis cum multo cætu nobilium, quorum alii potentiores auxilium et protectionem, divites pecuniam offerebant, pauperes, quod rebus non poterant, votis supplebant protensis in cælum manibus.* The foundation-stone was laid with great solemnity, a circumstance to which the author attributes special importance, because this represented the foundation-stone on which the entire church reposes, and other than which can no man lay. See Baluz. *Miscellan. T. IV. p. 130.*

ence which men who could exert an influence on the religious life soon acquired ; by the rapid spread of religious societies, whether connected with the church or with the sects that were opposed to it. •

Over against religion stood the rude power of unsubdued sensuousness, of fierce and eager passions, that announced themselves by rude outbreaks of crime, and either with brutal obstinacy maintained their ground, or finally yielded to the mightier force of religious impressions. "How many do we see every day," says the pious mystic, Richard a St. Victore,\* "who, amid the crimes which they are constantly committing, never abandon the hope and purpose of repentance ; and who not only mean to leave off sinning, but to renounce every worldly possession, and join themselves to some order of monks ; and so, if God, in his sovereign mercy, have compassion on them, they become reformed : but others, when exhorted to repentance, swear they never could prevail upon themselves to give up the world or abandon their lusts." †

Sudden transitions from the most violent outbreaks of sensual rudeness to emotions no less violently expressed, of a more or less enduring contrition, were of no rare occurrence. The awe-inspiring appearance and words of pious monks had a power, especially when strengthened by the impression of some remarkable incident, to produce great changes in minds whose religious susceptibilities had, as yet, been only kept back by the force of barbarism, as we have already seen illustrated ‡ in the remarkable effect produced by the monk Bernard of Tiron on a crew of barbarian pirates.

Active benevolence, hospitality, sympathy with the sick and suffering, kindness and respect shown to pious ecclesiastics and monks, devout participation in prayer and in all the ordinances considered as belonging to the church life, zeal in

\* De eruditione interioris hominis, L. II. c. xxv.

† His words : Quam multos quotidie videmus, qui inter flagitia, quæ assidue committunt, spem et propositum resipiscendi non amittunt et non solum peccata dimittere, imo etiam omnia quæ mundi sunt, relinquere et ad ordinem et religionem venire proponunt. Alii autem, cum de conversione admonentur, nunquam se ad ordinem vel religionem venire etiam cum juramento affirmant et cum de peccatis corripuntur se a suis voluptatibus non posse exhibere cum sacramento asseverant.

‡ See above, p. 327.



the Christian education of children, rigid abstinence,—such were the signs under which genuine piety exhibited itself even among the laity. A biographical sketch belonging to the twelfth century presents us with a picture of the piety of these times in the account of a married couple, who are held up as patterns. They owned and resided on an estate in the diocese of Vienne. They supported themselves by honest labour, lived with great frugality, gave liberally to the poor, and sympathised with them in their sufferings. They were full of respect and love to pious monks; and took great pains in bringing up their children to faith and good works. To neither of their sons, whom they destined for the spiritual profession, would they allow a benefice to be given in advance. After they had done educating their children, they practised a rigid abstinence, living like anchorets in the midst of the world, and devoting themselves with still more zeal than ever to the work of almsgiving. Sleeping themselves on straw, they gave up the better beds for the use of the poor; and while the whole of their house was ever open to the needy and the wayfaring, they set apart one chamber expressly for their use. As to the monks, they were not only ready to receive them, but took pains to fetch them in. They drew instruction from them about the way of salvation, not merely for their own benefit, but that they might be able to impart it to others. They exerted themselves to restore peace between parties at strife; to aid the injured, and to bring those who wronged others to a sense of their injustice.\* In the beginning of the twelfth century, we find a person in Brittany, by the name of Goisfred, who in his younger days had lived by robbery, but by the admonitions of his pious wife had been led to change the whole course of his life. He now lived by the labour of his own hands, and, reserving from his earnings barely enough to support himself and his family, distributed the rest in alms. During a violent snow-storm in mid-winter, he drove to a monastery with great difficulty a waggon laden with bread for the celebration of some saint-day.† In a biographical account of certain pious country-people, in the

\* Vita Patri Archiep. Tarantas: see above, p. 331. Acta Sanct. Mens. Maj. T. II. c. i. f. 324 et 325.

† Orderic. Vital. Hist. L. VI. f. 628.

twelfth century, the following points are cited as characteristic marks of the Christian life: both husband and wife showed by the best evidence—the fruits of their good works—that they were true Christians; for they were zealous in bestowing alms, in giving food to the hungry, in clothing the naked, and in performing other pious deeds of charity.\* Of the mother of archbishop Eberhard of Salzburg it is related, that she was almost constantly engaged in almsgiving, prayer, and fasting; and that she seldom ate anything but vegetables. She caused a church to be erected on her estate, and conveyed the stones for it two miles barefoot on her own shoulders; many other women followed her example.† It is recorded of a pious smith, in this century, that he daily lodged poor people in his own house, first washing their feet, and then providing beds for them.‡ The father of a family, whenever he went to church, took provisions with him for the poor people who lived in the neighbourhood.§ Ambrose of Siena, a much-venerated Dominican, who lived near the close of the thirteenth century, was descended from a respectable and wealthy family in that city. He was, while a youth and still living under the paternal roof, particularly distinguished for a spirit of active benevolence.

So it is said in the account of his life.|| The law of Christ is founded for the most part in love; this grace, therefore, predominated in him. He obtained leave from his wealthy father to take home with him every Saturday five strangers, to entertain them and present to each of them a certain sum of money. On every Saturday evening he placed himself near that gate of Siena which was the thoroughfare of those strangers who came from beyond the Alps. Choosing five from the whole, and conducting them to his own house, he showed them to a room set apart expressly for their service. He himself provided them with everything necessary to supply their bodily wants, till he had waited upon them to their beds. The next morning he accompanied them to mass, and then led them round to the principal churches of the city. Returning with them to his house, he gave them a breakfast, be-

\* Acta S. Mens. Januar. T. II. f. 795.

† L. c. Mens. Jun. T. IV.

‡ L. c. Mens. Jun. T. V. f. 115.

§ See life of the abbot Stephen of Obazine, L. I. c. iv.

|| Acta S. Mens. Mart. T. III. c. ii. f. 183.

stowed on them an alms besides, and dismissed them, after recommending himself to their prayers. But he took a special interest in the condition of those who languished in confinement. He was accustomed, on every Friday, to visit the public prisons; and, if he found any poor people there who were unable to provide for their own support, he took care to send them privately, one day in the week, a certain allowance of food and money. Every Sunday he visited the hospital of the city at meal-time, and assisted those who took care of the sick in distributing among the patients their allotted portions of food. He strove also to comfort them. He entered the houses of the poor; and, if he found any sick and wanting the necessaries of life, he begged of his parents that their wants might be relieved, and was himself the bearer of the charities bestowed on them. He declined all invitations to social parties and weddings; and already was he beginning to show symptoms not only of an inclination to withdraw from the world, but of a tendency to the monastic life, when, like St. Francis,\* he experienced a remarkable reaction of the freer Christian spirit. It so happened, that he was invited to attend a wedding-feast at the house of a relative. He declined the invitation, and in the mean time turned his steps to a Cistercian monastery beyond the walls of the city. While on the way, he was accosted by an old man, in the Dominican habit, who begged of him an alms, taking occasion at the same time of entering into conversation with him. He said: "Thou thinkest of gaining merit in the sight of God, and of better providing for thy soul's salvation, by shunning the society of thy relatives and associates, and declining to take any part in the celebration of a holy marriage; but I tell thee, thou wilt obtain more favour and merit in the sight of God if thou disdainest not to mingle in the society of thy associates; for it is far more praiseworthy in his sight to battle with the temptations and dangers of the soul, than to lead the secure life which thou proposest to do. Wilt thou not fall into the sin of pride, or give others occasion to accuse thee of it, if thou disdainest the society of those who would honour thee? And how wilt thou secure thy soul's salvation, if, without the marriage estate, which God has ordained, thou art unable to

\* See above p 376.

conquer the temptations of the flesh? It is the free gift of God which bestows on some the ability of leading a chaste life apart from marriage; but it is pride which leads thee to imagine thyself able to do this out of thy self-will, and by thine own efforts." The appearance of this free-minded sage was transformed by the people of those times into an appearance of Satan, disguised as a monk, for the purpose of deceiving the young man.

We read of an English nobleman, near the close of the eleventh century, who, finding himself shut up for a year in close confinement on account of some political change, gave himself wholly to exercises of penitence and devotion. The effects of the change which he underwent manifested themselves in the resignation and composure with which he met the death to which he was condemned. He walked to the scaffold clad in the costly robes which belonged to his rank and office; but on arriving there distributed them among the poor that stood around as spectators. Falling upon his knees, he prayed for some time, weeping. When the executioner, who had been ordered to hasten the execution of the sentence, urged him to stand up, he said: "Suffer me, in God's name, to repeat one more pater-noster for myself and for you;" and, again kneeling, he prayed with hands and eyes uplifted to heaven. But when he came to the words, "Lead us not into temptation," the tide of his inward feelings gushed forth in a flood of tears, and choked all further utterance.\*

An example of sincere and active piety from the class of common artisans is presented in the case of a certain Raymund Palmaris, at Placenza. Born in this city, in the year 1140, and descended from a pious family of the middle class, at twelve years of age he was apprenticed to an artisan; the occupation, however, did not suit a mind striving after higher things. Having lost his father while young, and being no longer obliged to follow the trade for which the father had destined him, he was seized with an earnest desire to quicken and nourish his devotion by a visit to the sacred spots in Palestine. Having made up his mind, he informed his pious mother of it, and she resolved to undertake the pilgrimage with him. After they had with great devotion visited

\* Orderic. Vital.\*f. 536.

all the spots consecrated to the memory of our Saviour, they returned home to their country. Raymund, soon afterwards, lost his mother, upon which he married, and resumed his former occupation. He had five sons; each of whom, when they received baptism, he was accustomed to dedicate to God with the following prayer: "Here is a being who wears thine image; to thee I dedicate him, as thy creature; life and death are in thy hands." The five children were all, one after another, removed from him in early life. He resigned himself to the will of God, and it was a comfort and joy to him that the Lord had called them, in the robes of innocence, out of this life of temptation, to himself. He looked upon it as an admonition, warning him thenceforth to live with his wife as if they were unmarried; which he proposed to her, having too conscientious a regard for duty to carry this plan into effect without the consent of his companion. Another son was born to him, and in the absence of his wife he took the child from its cradle, carried it to the church, threw himself down with it before a crucifix and prayed: "My Lord and Saviour, who stretchest out thine arms to receive all who come to thee, as thou hast taken to thyself my five children, in their tender age, and made them fellow-heirs of eternal bliss, I beseech thee vouchsafe to receive also to thyself this my little son, whom thou hast bestowed on me, beyond all my hopes. But, if thou hast destined him for a longer life, preserve him chaste and pure for the holy order of monks, to which I now consecrate him." Even at this time, while he was still an artisan, and had the care of a family, he improved every hour which he could spare from the business of his trade, and also the holidays, to obtain from pious and well-informed ecclesiastics and monks a more exact knowledge of the contents of the sacred Scriptures, and of the doctrines of religion. The knowledge thus acquired, he intended to use in promoting the salvation of his fellow-men. On Sundays and festivals he collected together in a workshop the people of his own class, and particularly such as followed the same trade with himself, and whom he could persuade to forego their customary amusements at those times, and addressed them on matters of practical Christianity. These addresses met with so much favour, that multitudes soon flocked together from all quarters to hear

him. Many invited him to preach in the public streets, and on the market-place; but this he refused, saying that it belonged to none but priests and the learned to do this; an uneducated man like himself might by this course easily fall into mistakes. He contented himself with simple practical exhortations, designed for his fellow-craftsmen; these considered him as their spiritual father, and lived as a pious community under his guidance. After the death of his wife, he resolved to carry out a purpose which he had long had in contemplation, and wholly withdraw himself from all secular business. He committed his little son to the care of his maternal grandparents, that he might be trained up to the profession of a pious monk. He surrendered into their hands all his property, to be managed and used for the benefit of this son. He now prepared to go on a pilgrimage to all the holy places, intending finally to settle down in the vicinity of the holy sepulchre, and there end his days. He had already completed the pilgrimage to St. Jago di Compostella in Spain, and other holy places, and had at length repaired to Rome, and was on the point of setting out for Jerusalem, but by the spirit of Christ he was taught a better course. The voice of that spirit, in the inmost recesses of a heart so warm with true piety, would doubtless often be heard remonstrating against the mistaken tendency into which the undue influence of religious feeling alone, in the absence of better knowledge, had hurried him. Such reaction of the genuine Christian spirit gave birth to a dream which befel him in one of the porches of St. Peter's church, where he once happened to lay himself down to sleep in his pilgrim-garb. Christ appeared to him, and told him that he was by no means pleased with his plan of making a pilgrimage to the holy sepulchre. "Thou oughtest," the voice seemed to say, "to employ thyself on things more acceptable to me and more profitable to thyself, on works of mercy. Believe not that, in the last day, I shall inquire particularly concerning pilgrimages and such pious acts, when I shall say, 'I was hungry, and ye gave me food,' &c. (Matt. xxiv.) Thou oughtest no longer to roam about thus in the world; but go back to thy native town, Placenza, where there are so many poor, so many forsaken widows; so many sick, who implore my compassion, and none to receive them. Go thither, and I will be with

thee, and give thee grace by which thou shalt be enabled to stir up the rich to benevolent action, to restore the contentious to peace, the wandering to the good way." In obedience to this admonition he returned, in 1178, to Placenza; and the bishop, to whom he made the matter known, felt bound to recognize it as a divine call. He was furnished with a house for the purpose he had in view by the canonical priests of the collegiate church. He sought out all the diffident poor, and such as were prevented by sickness from begging, collected alms for them, and took care of them. All who were helpless found welcome admittance and relief from him. His example operated upon others; many of the citizens associated themselves with him, to share, under his direction, the task of supporting and nursing the poor and the sick. He appropriated a separate dwelling for the sick and poor of the female sex; here also he received such as he succeeded in calling from a life of unchastity to repentance, and the direction of them he intrusted to pious, well-tried women. After they had lived some time in this manner, he left them free to choose the mode of life which would be most agreeable to them. If they preferred to marry, he endeavoured to assist them in this matter, and to procure for them a dowry from his pious friends. Those who showed an inclination for the monastic life he contrived to get admitted into monasteries. He diligently visited the prisons, distributed temporal relief among the prisoners, and by his exhortations and admonitions endeavoured to promote the salvation of their souls. In behalf of such as seemed to him to give proof of sincere penitence, he interceded with the magistrates, and became security for them that they would pursue a different course of life and prove useful to the state. Many of these, in order to escape temptations, withdrew to the monastic life, and distinguished themselves afterwards by the piety and integrity of their lives. He sought after outcast children, gently took them up in his arms, carried them home, and saw that they were taken care of. Oftentimes, he would take on his shoulders some sick person, whom he found lying in the street, and convey him home to the above-mentioned dwelling. Widows and orphans, and all who suffered wrong treatment, found in him a protector. Bearing his cross before him, and relying on him whom it symbolized, he feared nothing; to

that love which led Christ to give up his life for the salvation of mankind, he appealed, to exorcise passion. Thus he reconciled those who were at variance ; thus he sought to hush the strifes of fiercely contending factions amid the civil broils of Italy. When the citizens of Placenza and of Cremona were at war with each other, he threw himself between the two armies, and succeeded in persuading his countrymen to peace ; but the people of Cremona, indignant because he threatened them with divine judgments, hurried him away as a prisoner. Yet the spirit of love still continued to inspire him, and wrought so strongly on their feelings, that they soon let him go, repenting of their having so treated one whom they felt constrained to reverence as a saint. After having laboured in this manner for twenty-two years, he cheerfully looked forward to death. Commending to his associates the prosecution of his work, and exhorting them to take care of the poor whom he left behind, he thanked the Saviour that he had brought his earthly career to the long-desired goal ; he sent for his only remaining son, warned him against loving the empty goods of this world and yielding to its temptations, advised him to confirm the dedication that had been made of him when a child, and take refuge in the monastic life. He testified that he put no trust in his own merits, but confided solely in the mercy of Christ ; looking serenely on the cross, which had ever accompanied him in his consecrated labours, he said, “ In thy arms, in thy name and thy strength, I depart from this world to my Saviour and Creator.” These were his last words.\*

This particular shaping of the Christian life presents itself to us in a multitude of examples among all ranks of society. From the Christian artisan, let us now turn to the Christian prince. In king Louis the Ninth of France we see the piety of these times represented to us in all its noble traits, intermingled with those one-sided extravagances which called forth the covert censure of the free-spirited William of St.

\* The source of this narrative is a *Life*, in the Latin language, which certainly proceeded from a contemporary. We have it to regret, however, that this was lost, and only the Italian translation preserved, which was retranslated into Latin. It is to be found at the 28th July. *Mens. Jul. T. VI.*



Amour.\* On him, too, the training of a pious mother (Blanche), had exerted a decided influence, as he informs us himself. She surrounded him with pious monks; and on Sundays and festivals had him always attend the sermon. Having once heard it falsely reported of her son that he lived an unchaste life, she exhibited the utmost concern, and remarked that if her son, whom she loved more than any other creature, had fallen sick with a fatal disease, and she was assured that he might be restored by a single act of unchastity, she would prefer that he should die, rather than offend his Creator by a mortal sin. This remark left a deep impression on the mind of Louis, and he often repeated it, in expressing his abhorrence of that sin. "There was no leprosy so hateful," he was accustomed to say, "as a mortal sin is to the soul." He once remarked at his table, that "the devil took a very cunning course in seducing usurers and robbers, and then moving them to give what they had got by usury and robbery, for God's sake, to the church; when they knew to *whom* they must give it back at last." So, with reference to a similar case, he warned his son-in-law, Thiebault the Second, to take care lest he might bring his soul into jeopardy, if he supposed he could atone for all his sins by the bountiful alms which he bestowed on a Dominican monastery. Being threatened with shipwreck near the island of Cyprus, when on the voyage to make his crusade in the Holy Land, he sprang from his bed, and threw himself before a crucifix; and when the danger was over, he remarked, that "this threatening display of God's Almighty power ought to be regarded as an admonition calling upon them to make haste to purify themselves from all evil, and engage earnestly in every good work." Mindful of the temptations that constantly beset men, he considered steadfastness of faith as the greatest of all goods; and he exhorted all to strive after it in due season, that they might be well armed in the final hour, when Satan would seek to awaken in them all manner of doubts. "We should aim to possess it in such measure as to be able to say to him, 'Away hence, thou enemy of human nature; thou shalt not prevail to draw me off from that which I firmly believe.' Gladly would I suffer every limb to be severed from my body if I can only die in this faith."

\* See ante, page 399.

When he was taken prisoner by the Turks, and, to obtain his liberty and save his life, was required to promise something on his oath which he believed he would never be able to accomplish, he peremptorily refused, saying, if he should not fulfil what he had promised, he would be like a Christian that denied his God, the law of his God, and his baptism. He would rather die like a Christian, than live under God's anger. When he was informed of the death of his beloved mother, prostrating himself before the altar in his court-chapel he said: "My God, I thank thee that thou didst send my dearest mother to me. so long as it pleased thy goodness, and that thou hast now, after thine own good pleasure, taken her to thyself. It is true that I loved her as she deserved to be loved,—more than every other creature; but since it has so pleased thee, let thy name be eternally praised!" He set a high value on good sermons, and was in the habit of repeating them over with delight to others. Being detained ten weeks at sea on his return from the East, he caused three sermons weekly to be preached on board his ship. When the sea was calm and the mariners had little to do, considering how few opportunities they enjoyed of hearing the word of God, he ordered that a sermon should be preached expressly for them, on some subject appropriate to their condition, on the articles of faith, or the practical life of a Christian.

Reminding them of the dangers to which their lives were constantly exposed, he exhorted them to confess to priests of their own choice; and if, while they were confessing, a rope was to be pulled, or anything else needed to be done on board the ship, that required their help, he chose rather to lend a hand himself than suffer them to be interrupted when attending to the concerns of their salvation. By this means many were induced to confess who had not done so for years. Being informed that a Turkish Sultan had taken pains to collect, and to have transcribed, books of every kind that could be procured, for the use of the learned, he remarked that the children of darkness were wiser in their generation than the children of the light; and on his return to France he directed copies of the church-fathers, from all the monasteries, to be transcribed for himself and others. He preferred to have them copied rather than to purchase them, in order that the copies might be multiplied. He habitually refrained from every form of the

profane language which was everywhere so prevalent in those times. To avoid every sort of protestation, he was in the habit of substituting, in lieu of every other, the phrase, "In my own name;" but on hearing that this practice was censured by some monk, he ever afterwards contented himself with a simple yea or nay. As in the last years of his life he avoided all expensive raiment,\* thus occasioning a loss to the poor, on whom the garments he left off were usually bestowed as presents, he felt himself bound to make up the deficiency by adding to the sum which he yearly appropriated for alms. To the last days of his life he busied himself with the thought of a mission to Tunis. He died praying, with his eyes directed to heaven.

In addition to what we have cited on a former page,† from the last testament of Louis to his son, we may mention the following particulars as characteristic of the man: "I admonish thee to confess often, and to choose for thy confessors discreet and honest men, able to teach thee what thou hast to do and what to shun. And demean thyself so modestly towards thy confessors that they may venture kindly and boldly to reprove thee; conduct thyself so uprightly towards thy subjects, as ever to maintain the straightforward course, deviating neither to the right hand nor to the left, inclining rather to the side of the poor than of the rich, till thou art fully certain of the truth; but when one has a complaint against thyself, adopt thine adversary's side till thou hast ascertained the truth; thus will thy counsellors more readily declare themselves on the side of justice." The testament closes with these words: "In conclusion, I bestow on thee every blessing that a loving father can bestow on his son. May the whole Trinity and all the saints preserve thee from everything evil; and may God give thee grace so to do his will, that by thee he may be honoured; that so, after this life, we may together behold, love, and praise him without end."‡

From the female sex we may cite, in the same century, the landgravine Elizabeth of Hessa, St. Elizabeth, who after the

\* Of which William of St. Amour takes notice. See ante, page 395.

† Page 391.

‡ The sources, we have cited on page 395. All may be found collected in the *Actis Sanctorum*, fifth volume, month of August, under the 25th of the month.

death of her husband, retired wholly from the world. In the absence of the latter, she led a strictly ascetic life; but whenever she heard of his speedy return, she performed what to her must have been a still greater piece of self-denial, attiring herself in all her princely array; which she did, as she said, only from love to Christ, that her husband might not conceive dislike to her and be tempted to sin, but ever retain towards her true conjugal love, in the Lord.\*

The Christian life generally moved betwixt the two extremes of an excessive devotion to, and an undue estrangement from, the world. The first-mentioned tendency we find to have been that of the great mass, who supposed that, by a number of outward religious acts, in which they formally participated; by the repetition of certain prayers; by going to church; by making donations to churches and monasteries; by almsgiving, they satisfied every demand of Christianity,—while, at the same time, they abandoned themselves to their pleasures, till, impressed by some preacher of repentance, or surprised by some sudden calamity, they were led to perceive the vanity of their dead faith and of their mere outward Christianity, and excited to strive after the true essence of piety. In opposition to this worldly Christianity rose up, next, a much smaller number, with whom piety was really a matter of earnest and sincere concern; who were deeply imbued with the peculiar Christian spirit, but who, by reason of this opposition, were forced into an ascetic monk-like direction. Thus, there proceeded from the very midst of the laity pious societies, formed for the purpose of a spiritual, contemplative life, or for pious objects of a more practical character; the members of which commonly passed under the name of Beghards; a freer imitation of monasticism. We recognize in them that strong inclination to social union, quickened by religion, which distinguished the twelfth century,—the mighty energy of that idea of evangelical poverty which set itself in opposition to the secularization of the church. Among the quite diversified shapings which maintained a connection with, or stood out in opposition to, the church, we notice such pious societies as the one formed by Vicelin,† and those founded by Raymund Palmaris, by

\* See her life, by the Dominican Theodoric of Thuringia, Lib. II. c. v. Canisii, Lect. antiq. ed. Basnage, T. IV. f. 124.

† See ante, page 46.

the Apostolicians, the Waldenses,—at their first commencement,—of which we shall speak on a future page. When the minds of men were excited by the contests between Henry the Fourth and Gregory the Seventh, in Germany, such pious societies began to be formed also among the country people; by men and women, married and unmarried; who committed themselves to the guidance of ecclesiastics or monks.\*

Now when such names were once invented to designate that tendency of piety opposed to the world,—just as the term “Pietists” came to be employed in later times,—*Beghardi*, *Papelardi*,† *Boni homines*, *Boni valeti*,‡ it came about that these names, used in different senses to denote different sets of religious opinions, were laid hold of by men of a more liberal Christian spirit—like the above-mentioned William of St. Amour—as a sort of nickname for some caricature of piety,—though such caricatures were certainly in these days extremely rare,—as also by the mass of common worldlings, who contented themselves with a mere formal and outward Christianity, for the purpose of begetting mistrust in every form of uncommon seriousness in the Christian life, which they were unable to discriminate from the monk-like tendency.

A Parisian theologian of the thirteenth century, Robert de Sorbonne, founder of the famous college that went by his name, says, in his work on *Conscience*,—where he exhorts to rigid self-examination: “The Beguins, whether they are to be found in the world, or in the monkish orders, are wiser in this book (of *Conscience*), because they more frequently confess; for this reason they are denominated *papelardi* (pope-

\* Berthold of Constance, at the year 1091: Non solum autem virorum et feminarum innumerabilis multitudo his temporibus se ad hujusmodi vitam contulerunt, ut sub obedientia clericorum sive monachorum communiter viverent eisque more ancillarum quotidiani servitii pensum devotissime persolverent, in ipsis quoque villis filiae rusticorum innumerae conjugio et seculo abrenuntiare et sub alicujus sacerdotis obedientia vivere studuerunt, sed etiam ipsæ conjugatæ nihilominus religiose vivere et religiosis cum summa devotione non cessaverunt obedire. He immediately adds: Multæ villæ ex integro se religioni contradiderunt seque invicem sanctitate morum prævenire incessabiliter studuerunt. Monumenta res Alemannicas illustrantia, T. II. p. 148.

† See ante, page 395.

‡ See William of St. Amour, responsiones ad objecta, p. 92: Propter beguinas, bonos valetos, dicentes, quod vestis pretiosa portari non potest sine magno periculo.

servants).”\* He declaims against those who, when amongst worldly people, dressed and lived like them, and spoke ill of the devout; while, on the other hand, amongst the latter they dressed in their fashion and begged for their intercessions.† “Such persons, who can trim their sails to every breeze that blows,” says he, “the world pronounces wise and liberal.”‡ Those of the laity who led a stricter life, looked pale, and made it a point to swear no oath,—because they considered the words of Christ thus literally understood, if not as a commandment, yet as a *consilium evangelicum*,—were called by the sectarian name Catharians.§ Peter Cantor opposes to the severity with which men pronounced on the orthodoxy of others, their own extreme negligence with regard to morals. He says: “If we call every man who wanders ever so little from the faith a heretic,—why do we not, in like manner, complain of him who departs from the light of the moral law; why do we not say of him, that he walks not in the light, but in darkness?”|| He complains of those who, by their quibbling glosses, let down the requisitions of the Christian moral law, as propounded in the sermon on the mount, and would convert the strait gate of salvation into a wide one.¶

In order rightly to understand the shaping of the Christian life, and its extravagances in this period, we must present

\* Bibliotheca patrum Lugd. T. XXV. f. 350.

† L. c. f. 348: Tales homines cum sint cum papelardis viris et religiosis, dicunt: orate pro me, et faciunt Magdalenam, et quando sunt cum mundanis, faciunt sicut mundani, vel pejus et detrectant de peregrinis et religiosis viris et derident, ut habeant benevolentiam mundanorum.

‡ De talibus dicit mundus, quod sapientes sunt et liberales, quia optime sciunt se habere cum omni genere hominum et quod bonum est tales promovere.

§ Peter Cantor's words, Verbum Abbreviatum, c. cxxvii. p. 291: Si omnes alias perfectiones evangelicas ex voto possum suscipere et implere, quare et non similiter hoc consilium perfectionis? Vel cur hoc observantem statim proclamamus Catharum? Concerning a person, who quia pauper et pallidus, was held to be a Catharist, l. c. p. 201.

|| Si parum deviantem a fide vocamus hæreticum et increpamus, dicentes eum non esse in via, sed extra, quare et similiter recedentem in modico a luce moralium præceptorum non arguimus, objicientes ei, quod jam non sit in luce, sed tenebris. Verbum abbrev. c. lxxx. p. 213.

¶ Superflua expositione potius quam amore hanc portam adeo dilatavimus, quod jam angustias non habeat, ut sic intremus per latam portam, non per angustam. L. c. p. 211. et seqq.

distinctly before our minds the peculiar mode of apprehending the order of salvation ; for this will furnish a ground of explanation, or a point of attachment, for many things otherwise obscure. The tendency to the subjective—as we shall have to explain more at large in the section treating of doctrines—here predominated. Thus, for example, by justification,—which men considered as the necessary condition to the obtaining of salvation, as the sign of the elect,—was understood the internal work of making just,—sanctification through divine grace, which should manifest itself by good works proceeding from faith, and working by love (the *fides formata*). While now man's confidence, with reference to his salvation, was thus made to depend on something unsettled, subjected, and incapable of being defined by an infallible mark, the consequence was—according to the different characters and temperaments of men—either a one-sided spiritualization, or a one-sided externalization, of religion ; either a reflection upon one's self, absorbing the whole man, till he was led to doubt of his salvation ; or spiritual pride and work-holiness ;—except where these evil results were prevented by the predominant reference which, in spite of the subjective element of the church doctrine, still prevailed in the religious life to the objective side of redemption. One class cast themselves upon externals, sought the warrant of their justification in the works of mortifying the flesh, of benevolence, donations to the church, in the frequent use of the sacraments ; another class, consisting of persons of deeper feeling, looked within, and would attain to this assurance by watching the frames of their own mind, and thus, depending for their joy and their confidence on the changeful states of feelings oftentimes grounded in human weakness, they not seldom sought, by supernatural means, by visions, by special and extraordinary revelations, to obtain for themselves the assurance they were in quest of ; easily falling a prey to fanaticism or to absolute despair, whereby many, especially of those who were beginners in the spiritual life, would be led, after seeing the fruitlessness of their efforts, to give themselves up again wholly to the world. The experienced spiritual guides of these centuries often speak of these several dangers, and seek to guard men against them. Thus, for example, Richard a S. Victore warns against spiritual pride, against work-holiness, as well as against moral despondency. In re-

ference to the first he says: "We know that those good works which nourish the other virtues almost always undermine humility. The works of abstinence and of patience, which excite the wonder of mankind, are wont to render those who perform them proud instead of humble."\* In reference to the second he says: "When the soul, which has once despaired of its salvation, and is wholly deserted of the Holy Spirit, feels that it has no power to resist firmly-rooted habits, nor to restrain itself from the sin which cleaves to it, it is very apt to excuse itself, and to cast the blame upon its Maker. Men say, Everything must turn out as it has been foreordained. Who can resist the will of God? Can we create our own merits ourselves? In truth, nothing depends on our own willing or our own running, but everything upon the divine mercy. Why, then, does he not have mercy on us? Why does not he who works all in all, according to his will, work in us what is well-pleasing to himself?"†

By making their subjective feelings the ground of their assurance, men were the more troubled by those internal experiences which those who find not their home in the present world, but labour after a secret divine life, must at all times have;—that interchange in the life of the soul between light and darkness, a lively feeling of grace and inward desolation. The lives of the pious men of this period, and of the mystics, are full of these experiences.‡ Richard a Sancto Victore calls this "the necessary darkness, the necessary vicissitude of this present earthly life, where it cannot always be day, as it is in heaven, but the sun rises and sets."§

\* De præparatione animi ad contemplationem, c. xxx.

† De eruditione interioris, p. i. l. iii. c. xviii. Cæsarius, in his Narrations, Distinct. c. xxvii. cites the instance of a prince who, upon every exhortation to repentance, replied that, if he belonged to the elect, he should be saved at all events; and if he did not, all the efforts he might make would avail nothing. See above, p. 332.

‡ See History of Monachism, p. 239.

§ Quare ergo omne cor mæret, nisi quia nullum cor perpetuum diem hic habet, quia lumen cœli semper præsens habere non valet. Oritur enim sol et occidit et ad locum suum revertitur. Quid ergo mirum, si omne cor mæret, quamdiu necessarias tenebras hujusmodi alternantium vicissitudinum sustinet? Quamdiu in terra vivimus, quamdiu in terra sumus, has temporum vicissitudines necessario sustinemus. In cœlo dies sine nocte. De statu interioris hominis, Tract. I. p. i. c. xxvii.



The heavily-oppressed spirits often felt themselves relieved, as by a gift from Heaven, when the deep, dull pain of the soul, thirsting after the fountain of its life and longing after its home, could find vent in tears, that “*donum lachrymarum*,” of which so much is said in the testimonies concerning the internal life of this period. There was no want of important voices which expressed themselves emphatically against that externalization of religion in isolated good works, and which pointed those whose minds were solely directed to things outward and individual, to that which is required in order to true piety. In a sermon on Luke xi. 41, pope Innocent the Third extols, above all other good works, that of almsgiving. He says: “Almsgiving is more than fasting; since what the man denies to himself he gives to others. It is more than prayer, because it is better to pray with deeds than with words.” At the same time, however, he guards against a misapprehension of those words of Christ which he took for his text, by the remark—“But if the power of almsgiving is so great, men may do what they please, provided only they diligently bestow alms, secure in their reliance on those words of our Lord. Will, then, all things be pure to them that give alms, even to drunkards, to adulterers, to murderers, and to those who are stained with all the other pollutions of crime? May they, then, securely abandon themselves to all their pleasures, because alms suffice to redeem them from all sins? Far from it; since, as holy writ declares, Lev. xv., Whatever is touched by the unclean, becomes unclean. God looks rather upon *how* a thing is done than upon *what* is done.”\* And he quotes, in opposition to this false view of alms, the words of the apostle Paul—“Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity,” etc. True almsgiving proceeds, then, from love unfeigned. He raises the objection: “But I am poor; I have no bread, no clothing, no alms to bestow; nothing that I can give to others.” And he answers: “But recollect that with God the good will sufficeth, where the opportunity is wanting.” And, “God regards, in the gift,

\* Deus magis attendit modum in facto, quam factum in modo, id est quo modo aliquid fiat, quam quid aliquo modo fiat. De eleemosyna, c. iii. f. 201

not so much its magnitude as the measure of piety in the act of bestowing it."\* Bishop Hildebert of Mans wrote to a certain count of Angers, who was about starting on a pilgrimage to St. Jago di Compostella,†—"We deny not that this is a good thing, but he who undertakes a calling is obligated to obedience; and he sins if he forsake it without being called to something greater and more useful. Wherefore, look forward to thy great guilt, thou who preferrest that which is not necessary to the necessary; repose to activity in thy calling. Among the talents which the Master of the house gave to his servants to administer, no teacher nor passage of the Holy Scriptures mentions roving about in the world. But perhaps it will be said, the man is bound by a vow; recollect that *thou* hast bound *thyself* by thy vow, but God has bound thee by the duties of thy calling." And he then goes on to explain more at large how, with self-renunciation, he ought to fulfil his duties as a ruler, govern himself by the laws, his subordinates with love;‡ not stroll about to the churches of the saints, but bear within him the lively remembrance of their virtues."§ Concerning pilgrimages, Raymund Lull, in his work on Contemplation, expresses himself as follows: he first compares the procession of the pilgrims with the entry of Christ into Jerusalem,||—the pilgrims riding at their ease, living comfortably, and bearing the cross only on their cloaks; he contrasts what Christ did to seek men, with what they do to seek him: "We see the pilgrims travelling away into distant lands to seek thee, whilst thou art so near that every man, if he would, might find thee in his own house and chamber. Why are multitudes so ignorant as to travel away into distant lands to seek thee, carrying evil spirits with them, if they depart laden with sin? The pilgrims are so deceived by false men, whom they meet in taverns and churches, that many of them, when they return home, show themselves to be far worse than they were when they set out on their pilgrimage. He who would find thee,

\* Nec tam attendit in munere quantitatem, quam devotionem in opere, pensans magis ex quanto, quam quantum.

† Ep. 15.

‡ Te ipsum legibus, amore subjectos rege.

§ Nec circumferri per memorias lapidum, sed circumferre memoriam virtutum.

|| Cap. cxiii. f. 252.

O Lord, let him go forth to seek thee in love, loyalty, devotion, faith, hope, justice, mercy, and truth; for in every place where these are, there art thou. Blessed, then, are all they who seek thee in such things. The things which a man would find he should seek earnestly; and he must seek in the place where they are to be found. If, then, the pilgrims would find thee, they must carefully seek thee; and they must not seek thee in the images and paintings of churches, but in the hearts of holy men, in which thou dwellest day and night. The mode and the way to find thee stands within the power of man; for to remember thee, to love thee, to honour, to serve thee, to think of thine exalted dignity and on our own great wants,—this is the occasion and the way to find thee if we seek thee. Often have I sought thee on the cross, and my bodily eyes have not been able to find thee, although they have found thine image there, and a representation of thy death. And when I could not find thee with my bodily eyes, I have sought thee with the eye of my soul; and, thinking on thee, my soul found thee; and when it found thee, my heart began immediately to warm with the glow of love, my eyes to weep, my mouth to praise thee. How little profits it the pilgrims to roam through the world in quest of thee, if, when they have come back from their pilgrimage, they return again to sin and folly.” Bishop William of Paris, another distinguished man among the scholastic theologians of the thirteenth century, says, in one of his sermons: “The true pilgrimage is this,—to travel, by penitence, to the heavenly Jerusalem. This pilgrimage is more glorious than all others, for the reason that the others are performed for the sake of this; and, where this is wanting, the others are useless.” The same bishop remarks, in another sermon—“They present their bodies, not as a living but as a dead sacrifice, who say, I will cause myself to be buried and remain, after my death, in this or that order, while they continue to live on in their sins.” The abbot Bernard of Tiron,\* said to the monks assembled around his dying bed: “All virtue, besides love, is perishable; in this consists the essence of all God’s commandments; by this alone the disciples of Christ are distinguished from the servants of antichrist. By this alone will men recognize them

\* See above, p. 327.

as Christ's disciples, not by the circumstance that they observed superstitious ordinances; these promoted sin far more than edification." He lamented that he had been so long a slave to such outward ordinances, and had laid such a yoke upon others.\*

Many bright testimonies of this Christian spirit, that pointed a way from the outward to the inward, we find in the works of Raymund Lull. We will cite a few of them. "The figure of the holy cross," says he, "laments over those hypocrites who simulate the poverty and suffering represented by it, with a view to appear as saints to the people, and who are unwilling to follow after it by the performance of real good works.† We see the holy cross honoured with gold, silver, precious stones, silks, and paintings of various colours, but we see it little honoured by love, tears, contrition, devotion, and holy thoughts; and yet the wooden cross, before which a sinner weeps, receives more honour than the cross of gold, before which a sinner stands thinking of the vanities of the world.‡ The image of the crucified Christ is found much rather in men who imitate him in their daily walk than in a crucifix made of wood."§ All the Christian virtues he represents as signs of that constitution of soul which is requisite in order to salvation;|| "but from these signs," says he, "it is still impossible to know whether one is in the way of salvation; because that which shows itself in outward appearance is no certain expression of the disposition within, on which alone everything depends; for those persons who fast, give alms,

\* In hoc solo cognoscent homines, quia Christi sitis discipuli, non si superstitionum observatores traditionum extiteritis, sed si dilectionem ad invicem habueritis. Concerning the former he says, quibus non parvo tempore ipse subjacueram, quasque aliis per nonnulla annorum curricula instanter ferendas imposueram. *Acta S. Mens. April, T. II. f. 249.*

† Conqueritur, quia ipsi eam in se fingunt, ut videantur a gentibus in similitudinem bonorum hominum, et nolunt ipsam imitari faciundo vera esse opera.

‡ Majorem honorationem recipit crux lignea, coram qua peccator plorat, quam crux aurea, coram qua peccator stat memorando vanitates hujus mundi.

§ Quoniam figura, quam videmus in cruce, est pictura in ligno, sed beatus religiosus est illius speciei, cujus est tua gloriosa humanitas. *Liber contemplationis, vol. II. Distinct. 23, c. cxxiii. T. I. f. 280.*

|| Omnes virtutes signa et significationes et demonstrationes salvationis.

and speak words of humility, clothe themselves in rags, and subject themselves to many self-denials, may yet, with all this unite a false bent of the inward temper;\* and others may eat and sleep well and wear comfortable garments who do this with a good intention, and to avoid making a parade of their piety.”† “The poor man, when he gives a small portion of bread in true piety and contrition, to another poor man, is more benefited than the rich man, who gives the poor bread and meat from vanity and in a false intention.”‡ “A small piece of money which the poor man gives out of love to God, is more than a large sum which the rich man bestows in such intention; and the rich man is more acceptable before God when, from love to God he is humble, simple, and courteous, than the poor man who, from love to God, is the same.”§ Prayer he describes as the soul of the Christian life. “It is ordained of God as the ladder by which man mounts from this dark place to the eternal glory. As often as man begins to pray, while praising and loving God, testifying of his goodness and acknowledging his own wretchedness, so often he begins to mount upward to God. Prayer converts the proud man into an humble one, the disdainful man into a simple and courteous one.”|| “A man better defends himself against temptation with prayer than with fasting.”¶ “Devotion in prayer is so good a thing, that the prayer of uneducated men or women, who pray in rude language but with great devotion, is far more acceptable than the prayer of the great and learned, and of prelates, who pray with fine words but without devotion, since they have their hearts and their imaginations set on other things quite at variance with those denoted by their words.”\*\* He called that acceptable prayer to God which aims at obtaining the forgiveness of sin, humility, wisdom, love. “But many,” says he, “pray daily for the glory of paradise, and yet in their hearts love the joys of this world more than the glory they pray for; and as they love the goods of this world more than those of the other, they are not

\* *Possunt habere in istis rebus falsam et inordinatam intentionem.*

† *L. c. f. 461.*

‡ *L. c. f. 184.*

§ *L. c. f. 162.*

|| *L. c. f. 125.*

¶ *Homo melius se defendit a tentatione cum oratione quam cum jejunio. De centum nominibus Dei, c. ii, T. VI. f. 23.*

\*\* *De contemplatione Dei, Vol. II. L. III. Dist. 29, c. cc. f. 498.*

worthy of attaining to the celestial goods.”\* He distinguishes three kinds of prayer,—prayer in words (the *oratio sensualis*), the internal prayer of the spirit (*oratio intellectualis*), and that embracing the whole life. “He who is just, compassionate, humble, patient, prays, although he is not consciously thinking of God. To this act belong all works which pious men perform. Whatsoever such a person may do, whether he eat, or drink, or sleep, buy or sell, dig or plough, he prays to God and praises God.”† The temper which should be the soul of the Christian life he represents as love, concerning whose holy fervour he could testify more fully than any other individual. “As the needle,” says he, “when touched by the magnet, points naturally to the north, so must thy servant turn thither to love and praise God his Lord, and to serve him, since from love to him the Lord has been willing to endure heavy pains and sufferings in this world.”‡

Among his spirited aphorisms we find the following, which belong here. “He who bestows on his friend his love, bestows on him more than if he gave him treasures of gold; he who gives God, *can* give nothing more”§ (alluding to the words of the apostle John, that God is love). With this saying we may compare what Richard a Sancto Victore remarks, on the other hand, concerning those who sow contentions. “He treats you in a godless manner who robs you of your money, but how is it with him who deprives you of love? Does he treat you cruelly who robs you of your garment? how much more then he who deprives you of love; for if it is cruel to rob a man of his outward and perishable goods, it must be still more so to deprive him of the internal ever-abiding goods, for charity never ceases. Of a truth, whoever

\* L. c. f. 499.

† L. c. Vol. III. L. V. Dist. 40, c. cccxv. T. X. f. 339.

‡ Sicut acus per naturam vertitur ad septentrionem, dum sit tacta a magnete, ita oportet, quod tuus servus se vertat ad amandum et laudandum suum Dominum Deum, et ad serviendum ei, quoniam pro suo amore voluit in hoc mundo sustinere graves dolores et graves passiones. De contemplatione Dei, Vol. II. L. III. Dist. 27, c. cxxx. T. IX. f. 296.

§ Qui dat bonum amare suo amico, illi plus dat, quam si illi daret omne aurum; qui dat Deum, non potest plus dare. De centum nominibus Dei, c. xxxi. T. VI. f. 15.

deprives a man of love deprives him also of God, for God is love."\* Again says Raymond Lull: "He who loves not, lives not."† "The spirit longs after nothing as it does after God. No gold is worth so much as a sigh of holy longing. The more of this longing one has, the more of life he has. The want of this longing is death. Have this longing, and thou shalt live. He is not poor who possesses this; unhappy the man who lives without it."‡ "Were there no sin," says he, "all temporal goods would be held in common by all." The activity of love in almsgiving he considered as that whereby all those distinctions which had proceeded from sin were to be again done away.§

Although an enthusiastic admirer of monasticism, yet Raymond Lull objected to an excessive asceticism, or one that does not spring out of the temper of love, and places the love that unites together the practical and contemplative life, and is active in promoting the salvation of others, above everything else. "The body which has been too much mortified," says he, "is suited for neither the active nor the contemplative life. Thou wilt be a murderer, if thou destroyest thyself slowly as much as if thou doest it at once. God does not bestow earthly blessings on men for nothing; as thou must eat in order to live, so thou must not fast in order to die. Hypocrisy steals upon those who impose on themselves excessive mortification."|| "No hermit does so much good as a good preacher, who has the contemplative life in himself, and shows the practical in his preaching. Better is a life spent in instructing others than one spent in fasting."¶

In his great work concerning Contemplation in God, Ray-

\* De eruditione interioris hominis, p. i. L. III. c. iv. f. 107.

† Qui non amat, non vivit. Liber proverborum, c. xvii. T. VI. f. 10.

‡ Qui plus desiderat, plus scit de vivere. Privatio desiderii est mori. Desidera et vives. Non est pauper, qui desiderat. Tristis vivit, qui non desiderat. De centum nominibus Dei, c. xc. Lib. Proverborum, p. i. T. VI. f. 38.

§ Si peccatum non esset, omnia temporalia bona essent communia. Elemosyna est figura communis boni. Prov. moral. c. lxx. T. VI. f. 119.

|| Proverb. moral. c. lxxix. f. 119.

¶ Nullus eremita facit tantum bonum, sicut bonus prædicator, qui habet vitam contemplativam in se ipso et activam in prædicando. Vita est melior per doctrinam, quam per jejunium. L. c. p. iii. c. li. f. 110.

mund Lull exhibits, in all the ranks and professions of Christendom, the contrast between what they are and what they ought to be,\* and points away from the corruption of all to Christ. While he thus treats of princes and nobles, and complains that no access is to be found to them, when it is needed, in reference to the matters for which they are placed over others,—for the gates of the palaces are shut, and the porters threaten those who would enter them; he thereupon betakes himself to God, and says, “Praised then be thou, that the case is not so with thee,—for as often as man would see thee, contemplate thee, address thee, he can do so, and the door is never shut.”†

We will quote, in addition, a few things from the sayings of the Franciscan, Ægidius of Assisi, a friend of Francis of Assisi, as testimonies of the internal Christian experience of these times: “One grace draws after it another, and one crime draws after it another.”‡ “Grace cannot bear to be praised, nor crime to be despised. Purity of heart *sees* God, devotion *enjoys* him. While a man lives, he must not despair of God’s mercy; for there is no tree so distorted that human art

\* As this work will be accessible to but few of my readers, I have thought it might be agreeable to them if I should quote a few passages from Raymund Lull on this point. He speaks earnestly against the manner in which princes, abusing their power, acted in contradiction to their high calling, *ut teneant pacem in terra et ut gentes secure possint ire per vias et secure manere in suis domibus*. He says of them, *quod totum mundum teneant in bello et labore*. And he expresses his surprise, *quod tam pauci homines teneant in labore tot gentes, quot sunt in hoc mundo*. He says that the majority of them *ipsi se faciant servos vilium hominum*. He speaks of their love of the chase; he describes how they excused themselves on the plea that this was their *relaxation*; and thus pretending that by such pursuits they avoided sin; *sed non attendunt ad malos procuratores, quos relinquunt loco sui et qui sunt populo sicut lupi voraces et dum ipsi venantur et se recreant, lupi comedunt oves sibi commissas*. In complaining of the cupidity, the ambition, and the ignorance of *physicians* (*quia operantur in infirmis plus casualiter, quam certa scientia, ideo plures homines occiduntur quam sanantur a medicis*), he recommends, as the best practice of medicine, that the patient should study his own case, find out what ails him, et caveat, ne utatur rebus contrariis et sinat operari in se cursum naturæ.

† *Igitur benedictus sis, quia non est ita de te, quoniam quotiescunque homo velit videre te et contemplando loqui tecum, semper potest, nunquam januæ sunt clausæ*, Vol. II. L. III. Distinct. 23, c. cxi. T. IX. f. 247.

‡ *Gratia attrahit gratiam et unum vitium trahit ad aliud*.



cannot make it straight again;—*a fortiori*, there is no person in the world whose sins are so grievous that God cannot adorn him with grace and virtues. All love of the creature is nothing in comparison with love of the Creator. Only through humility can man attain to the knowledge of God; the path upward begins downward.\* It is better to suffer a heavy wrong without murmuring, out of love to God, than to feed daily a hundred poor, and to fast many days far into the night. What does it profit a man to despise himself and to mortify his body with fasting, prayer, vigils, and self-scourging, if he is not able to endure a wrong from his neighbour, which would bring him greater reward than all the mortifications he imposes on himself? Should the Lord rain stones from heaven, they would not harm us, if we were what we ought to be. If a man were what he ought to be, evil would for him transform itself into good; for all great good, and all great evil, are within the man, where none can see them. It is a great virtue to conquer one's self; if thou conquerest thyself, thou wilt conquer all thine enemies. Every man has just so much knowledge and wisdom as he performs good deeds." When Ægidius came in contact with persons who dreaded undertaking any good thing, for fear that vanity might mix in and spoil the whole, said he, "Be not withheld by this from doing good. If the husbandman, when about to scatter his seed on the earth, should say within himself, 'I will not sow this year, for fear the birds may come and devour the seed,' he would afterwards find himself in want of food to supply his wants; but if he sow, and it should really happen that some of his seed perishes, yet the greatest portion will remain to him. So it is with him who is tempted with the love of fame and fights against it." Speaking of the inexhaustible store of the knowledge of God yet in reserve for man, he said: "The entire Holy Scriptures speak to us as it were with a lisping tongue, as a mother talks to her little child; because, otherwise, it would be unable to understand her words."†

It is true, the love of the wonderful prevailed very generally, and the lives of the saints, in order to be popular with the

\* *Via cundi sursum est ire deorsum.*

† *Tota sacra scriptura loquitur nobis tanquam balbutiendo, sicut mater balbutiens cum filio suo parvulo, qui aliter non potest intelligere verba ejus. Acta Sanct. Mens. April. T. III. f. 227, seqq.*

multitude, must needs say a good deal about their miracles.\* But neither were there wanting those who combated this tendency; and from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries onwards, a series of testimonies might be cited on the true import and significance of the miracle, in its relation to the divine life; and against the overvaluation of the externally wonderful—thoughts which are not barely the property of a few enlightened individuals elevated above their times, but which may be considered as expressing the common Christian consciousness of these centuries.† The monk Stephen, who in the twelfth century described the life of his master, the abbot Stephen of Obaize, a man distinguished for his pious and influential activity, adduces no miracle of his; but asserts that, for this reason, he stands not inferior to that active wonder-worker, Martin of Tours; for, to awaken so many men and women, who were sunk in all manner of vice, by repentance, to eternal life, was a far greater work than if he had awakened them from natural death.‡ The author of the life of the abbot Bernard of Tiron says, in his preface to that work: “If any, following the pattern of Jewish unbelief, seek after miracles, and would estimate the character of the saints solely according to the number of these, what would he say of Mary, or of John the Baptist? But in the day of judgment many who wrought miracles will be rejected, and those alone attain to salvation who have striven after works of righteousness. We praise then our father Bernard, not for the reason that he wrought miracles (although these were not wholly wanting),—but we set him forth as one who meekly, humbly, and from his heart followed in the steps of our Lord Christ.”§ “Visible miracles,” says the author of the life of Norbert, “may properly excite the wonder of the simple and ignorant; but the patient endurance and virtues of the saints are worthy of the admira-

\*Quod maxime nunc exigitur ab his, qui sanctorum vitas describere volunt. The preface to the life of the abbot Stephen of Obaize, which was composed by his disciple, Stephen. Baluz. Miscellan. iv. p. 69.

† Comp. the passages already cited, p. 424.

‡ After having spoken of the great numbers of unchaste women converted by him he says: Qui ergo de talibus pœnitentiæ remedio et prævenientis gratiæ dono castas atque mundissimas Christo sponas exhibuit, non dubito majoris hoc fuisse virtutis, quam si eas corpore mortuas suscitasset. IV. f. 106.

§ Acta Sanct. Mens. April T. II. f. 223.

tion, and of the imitation, of those who would be soldiers of Christ.”\*

From the time of this new excitement of the religious life in the beginning of the twelfth century, the want of preaching in the native languages of the different countries became deeply felt, and the more complete formation of these languages was brought about at the time most convenient to meet this want; as the German language had already been found peculiarly well adapted to sacred poetry.† It is very evident how fervently the people greeted those ecclesiastics and monks who travelled about as preachers of repentance; and it was the same state of feeling, moreover, that procured such a rush of hearers for those who used their influence with the people in combating the doctrines of the church and diffusing heretical principles. The church would be compelled, therefore, by the interest of self-preservation, to bestow more attention on the management of the predicatorial office. Several writings appeared, which treated of this subject. We may first mention here the work of the abbot Guibert, of Novigentum, on the right method of preaching.‡ He declared it to be the general duty of Christians, and not confined solely to bishops, to labour for the advancement of the Christian life in others, according to the proportion of each man's knowledge and gifts. “Suppose one be neither a bishop nor an abbot, still, he is a Christian. If he would live a Christian life he must honour the Christian name, as in himself so also in others.” He requires of the preacher that he should have respect to the wants of the simple and uneducated as well as the better informed; that he should endeavour to unite depth with lucidity and plainness of meaning. § “Let the sermon,” says he, “be preceded by prayer; so that the soul, fired with divine love, may utter forth what it feels of God, with glowing words; so that the preacher, as he burns in his own heart, may enkindle

\* *Visibilia miracula simplicibus et idiotis stupenda sunt, patientia vero et virtutes sanctorum his, qui ad Christi militiam se accingunt, adiuvandæ sunt et imitandæ.* Mens. Jun. T. I. f. 824.

† *Tota terra jubilat in Christi laudibus etiam per cantilenas linguæ vulgaris, maxime in Teutonicis, quorum lingua magis apta est concinnis canticis.* See the words of Gerhoh of Reichersberg, quoted on p. 214

‡ *Quo ordine sermo fieri debeat.*

§ *Ut idiotis ac simplicibus perspicuum, quod dicitur, esse queat.*

a flame also in the hearts of his hearers." He required especially, that the sermon should contain ethical matter. "The preacher should treat concerning the motions of the inner man. This was a thing so common to the experience of all men, that such a sermon could be obscure to none. Every man could read in his own heart, written as it were in a book, what he heard said of the various kinds of temptation.\* No sermon was more useful than that which showed men to themselves, and led back those who, by the distraction of outward things, had become estranged from themselves to the secret recesses of their hearts; presenting them, as if reflected from a mirror, before their own eyes." † "But as, in describing a battle in the field, he who took part in the fight will be able to give an entirely different account of it from one who knows nothing about it except from the report of others, so is it with the spiritual warfare. He whose own conscience bears witness to that which he expresses in words, will treat of spiritual conflicts with an altogether different sort of authority, and be able to point as it were with his finger to all the particulars." ‡

We ought especially to mention here a work abounding in good matter, and worthy of the special consideration of those times in which, in the thirteenth century, Humbert de Romanis, § general of the order of Dominicans, endeavoured to set forth to the members of his order the obligation incumbent on them of preaching the gospel; the gravity and dignity of this vocation; and the qualifications requisite for the right discharge of it. || Of all the spiritual exercises in which

\* *Præsertim cum unusquisque intra seipsum quasi in libro scriptum attendat, quicquid de diversis tentationibus prædicatoris lingua retractat.*

† *Nulla enim prædicatio salubrior mihi videtur, quam illa, quæ hominem sibi met ostendat et foras extra se sparsum in interiori suo restituat atque cum coarguens quodammodo depictum ante faciem suam statuât.*

‡ This tract of Guibert forms the introduction to his work on the exposition of Genesis, in ten books, in which he aims to show how everything in holy Scripture may be applied to a moral end, and so made use of for preaching. He was induced to undertake this work by a prior, who heard a sermon of his, and requested him to compose a work for himself, from which he might learn how to work everything into matter for preaching (*ut id sibi scriberem, in quo materiam sumendi cujuscunque sermonis acciperet*). See his Tract, *De vita sua*, Lib. I. f. 477.

§ So named from his native town, Romans, in Burgundy.

|| His work, *De eruditione prædicatorum*, in two books, published in the twenty-fifth volume of the *Bibliotheca patrum*, Lugd.

the monks employed themselves, he describes preaching as the most excellent; and declares that whoever possessed the talent for it, was bound to cultivate it most assiduously.\* It was more than all fasting and all mortification of the body; for all these bodily exercises, according to 1 Timothy iv., profit but little; but preaching effected much good. Besides, an indigent preacher, truly zealous for the salvation of souls, had more to suffer than all those mortifications could amount to which a man imposes on himself. He cites, in confirmation of this, the remark of a man that had passed over from the Cistercian to the Dominican order, and affirmed, that he "had had more to suffer in a few days, when he itinerated as a preacher, than during the whole time he had spent in his old order. Other monks busied themselves with works of charity pertaining to the body; but preaching was as much above these as the soul is more than the body." He refers to the words of Christ, Luke ix. 60, "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." He sets preaching above prayer; above the study of the sacred Scriptures, if they are not studied as a help to preaching; above the celebration of the mass, and the liturgical acts of worship; "for the Latin liturgy the laity understand nothing; but they can understand the sermon; and hence, by preaching God is glorified in a clearer and more open manner than by other acts of worship."† Furthermore, he appeals to the example of Christ: "Christ celebrated the mass but once; heard no confessions; seldom administered the sacraments; did not employ himself much in the liturgical adoration of God; but he was constantly engaged in prayer and preaching. Indeed, after he had once commenced preaching, he spent his whole life in that employment, much more than in prayer." He dwells on the great effects which sermons might produce in his own times; describes how the multitude ran after them.‡ He relates that certain ecclesiastics had discussed together, before an eminent archbishop, the question what good has been effected by the mul-

\* Lib. I. c. xx.

† In prædicatione intelligunt, quæ dicuntur, et ideo per prædicationem clarius et apertius laudatur Deus.

‡ Interdum ista devotio facit multos sequi prædicatorem, sicut visum est in diebus nostris frequenter. Lib. I. c. iv.

titude of sermons preached by the new order of monks, since vice and crime prevail in the world to as great a degree as ever? Upon this the archbishop remarked, "As there is still so much vice, and those good men have been the means of extirpating so much by their preaching, what would the case have been if such preachers had never appeared?"\* Humbert examines into the hindrances by which many were prevented from preaching, with a view of depriving those whom he would urge to engage in it of all grounds of excuse. "Thus, some," he said, "were kept back by the love of contemplative quiet; such had the more to answer for, in proportion to the good they might have done by public activity. Others were hindered through dread of the temptations to sin." He meets the case of such by saying, "It is sometimes better for men to toil, even though by toiling they may cover themselves with dust, than to sit always in perfect tidiness at home. Others deferred the work too long, from the desire of attaining to a certain degree of perfection, which perhaps they would never reach."† He says to them: "The friends sleep, and meantime the house is on fire; an enemy breaks in, and yet they cannot arouse themselves. Others were deterred by dread of the want to which they must expose themselves in preaching the gospel." Before such he holds up the poverty of Christ, and asks, "What preacher, of the present age, would have to suffer want to that degree as not to be able to find, at least in populous cities, the necessary means for the support of life? Others were intimidated by the perverseness of many of the prelates, who sought to hinder the preaching which it was much more their duty to encourage; as the scribes and pharisees had done among the Jews, and the priests among the pagans."‡ He calls upon the preacher to go about every where; and to labour wherever there was need of it. "What sort of preachers are those who would always remain inactive at home?"§ We

\* Lib. I. c. ii.

† *Preparatio nimis morosa ad hoc officium.*

‡ Lib. I. c. xvi. to xxi. *Sunt multi prælati, qui non solum non prædicant, sed etiam ne alii, qui hoc laudabiliter possunt facere, faciant prohi-*

§ *Quales ergo prædicatores sunt, qui semper quiescere volunt in domibus vel in castris suis.* L. c. c. xxi.

may observe how the zeal with which the heretics, that appeared in opposition to the church, laboured to propagate their doctrines served to call forth a reaction on the part of those who were engaged in the service of the church. He holds up the example of the former as worthy of imitation; describing their incessant activity in running about to houses and villages, at the hazard of their lives, for the purpose of leading souls astray.\* But at the same time, he warns against the false zeal of an indiscreet obtrusiveness, advising his monks not to appear in improper places; not to hold forth, as many did, at markets and fairs; since in these places men were wholly engrossed in worldly affairs, and reverence for the divine word could not fail to suffer injury; but to choose befitting spots, as Paul preached in the synagogues and our Lord in the temple, or even in the open fields, where the attention of men was not liable to be diverted by worldly occupations.†

He furthermore gives many admonitions and warnings to preachers with regard to the right method of preaching:—"Though the talent for preaching," he says, "is obtained through the special gift of God, yet the wise preacher will do his own part of the work, and diligently study, in order that he may preach correctly." But he warns against a mistake committed by many, who were for making a display of their own ingenuity and eloquence, and, as the people of Athens required, were ever on the search for something new to say.‡ Thus he unites in the same censure which the opponent of his order, William of St. Amour, pronounces against the preachers of the two mendicant orders,—that they lacked the simplicity of the gospel, and affected to exhibit themselves as philosophers.§ "But the good preacher," said he, "would aim

\* Hæretici cum periculo corporis non cessant per domos et villas discurrere, ut pervertant animas. L. c. c. xxxi.

† L. c. c. xvii.

‡ Sunt quidam prædicatores, qui cum student ad prædicandum, interdum applicant studium suum circa subtilia, volentes plectere et texere subtilia circa nova, more Atheniensium vocantes ad dicendum nova, interdum circa sophismata, linguam suam volentes magnificare. Lib. I. c. vi.

§ De periculis novissimorum temporum, L. c. p. 71. Quod veri Apostoli non intendunt nec innituntur rationibus logicis aut philosophicis. Illi ergo prædicatores, qui hujusmodi rationibus innituntur, non sunt veri Apostoli, sed pseudo.

rather at that which might prove useful,—which might serve to promote devotion.” He declaims against excessive prolixity and frequent repetitions in sermons,—against those who were for displaying their ingenuity in deriving the theme of their discourse from a text altogether foreign from the matter in hand.\* Such tricks would rather excite derision than promote edification.† He speaks against those who looked more to fine words than to the thoughts; comparing them with people who took more pains to make a display of beautiful dishes than of good food upon them.‡

With regard to the effects produced by preaching, he says,§—“Many hear the word of God with great delight; but it is the same as if they were listening to a beautiful song. Others experience a great effect on their feelings for the moment, but it is of no benefit to them, because, after the sermon, they become immediately cold again.” He applies to them 1 Kings xix. 11, “The Lord was not in the whirlwind.” “Others,” says he, “are good judges of preaching,—he has spoken well or badly, say they; the sermon was too long, too short, too abstruse, too trivial,—but they never think of applying what is said to their own lives.”

He takes particular notice, also, of the different ranks and occupations of men, and hints at the kind of instruction suited to each. Of the great, as well as of the poor, he says, that they seldom visited the churches, which were mostly frequented therefore by persons of the middle class, and hence, the opportunity of addressing them ought to be the more carefully improved. As it was but seldom they heard sermons, it was a work of love for the preacher, whenever he could find them together and have access to them, to address them the word of exhortation, for they greatly needed it.|| And he exhorts the preacher to set home upon the great, the duties which they owed to their inferiors. “The poor,” says he, “come seldom to church,—seldom to hear preaching,—for this reason they

\* Thus, one who would treat concerning the apostles Peter and Paul, took for his text Numbers iii. 20.

† Solet autem accidere frequenter, quod hujusmodi themata extranea non possunt aptari, nisi cum magna et incongrua extorsione sententiæ et ideo potius inducunt derisionem quam ædificationem.

‡ L. I. c. vi.

§ L. c. c. xxvi.

|| L. II. c. lxxxiii.



know little about things that minister to salvation : and hence, if they are ever found collected at church, or elsewhere, they should be instructed in that which it concerns all Christians to know.\* He instances the case where numbers come together in large ships, thus furnishing an opportunity for any who may be disposed to preach to them.† The sensuous bent of devotion paid but little regard to preaching, and hence Humbert laments over the case of the poor women who knew no better than to neglect the preached word, busying themselves, while it was delivering, either in repeating their prayers, in kneeling before the images, or in taking the holy water.‡ When it was seen that a pope, like Innocent the Third, would not allow himself to be deterred, by the enormous pressure of his affairs, from the zealous preaching of the word,§—this fact would doubtless serve to beget in many a high sense of the importance of the predicatorial office in its bearing on church life. We hear this pope himself lamenting in his sermons that, by the great multitude of affairs which demanded his attention, he was prevented from bestowing the care which he wished to expend on the composition and delivery of his discourses. Yet he was unwilling to remain wholly silent on festival occasions, though he could not accomplish what he would have been glad to do.|| His sermons bear witness to his earnest zeal for the advancement of practical Christianity, in opposition to a certain superstition which resisted it ; and of this we have already cited some examples. He protested strongly, amongst other things, against a superstitious and excessive image-worship, which he calls a species of idolatry.¶ Concerning the greatest teacher of scientific theology of his age, Thomas

\* L. II. c. xxvi.

† L. c. c. xci.

‡ L. c. c. ci.

§ Humbert de Romanis relates that, on a certain high festival, he delivered before the people a homily, written by Gregory the Great on this festival, and translated into the vernacular tongue. L. c. Lib. I. c. vi.

|| S. i. Quadrages : Sæpe necessitas impedit, quod requirit utilitas, quod ipse nunc experiri compellor. Requirit enim utilitas, ut his sacris diebus frequentius solito per exhortationes sermonum debeam populos admonere, sed impedit hoc necessitas, quia præter solitum imo plus solito multis et magnis sum occupatus negotiis, ut nullum mihi sit otium otiosum. Opp. f. 40.

¶ Quid est, quod quidam sub prætextu pietatis et obtentu religionis, ut cætera taceam, diversas adorant imagines, tanquam liceat manufactum aliquid adorare ? In Dedicat. templi, s. iii. f. 75.

Aquinas, it is related that he took the utmost pains to preach plainly, in the Italian language, and to abstain from all matters which would not contribute to the edification of the people, by whom he was listened to with great reverence.\*

From the middle of the thirteenth century to the year 1272, in which he died, the Franciscan Berthold held the first rank as a preacher of repentance in the cities of Regensburg and Augsburg. His labours were extended from Bavaria to Thuringia, and far into Switzerland. He was invited to preach first in one city and then in another. No church was large enough to hold the multitudes that came to hear him. He often preached in the open fields, where a pulpit had been erected for him, with more than sixty thousand people assembled around him. He fearlessly rebuked the vices of all ranks of society, high and low, rich and poor. Many were converted under his preaching, and freely confessed their sins to him. Among this number were women of very immodest habits of life; who immediately abandoned their dishonest calling, and were married by him to husbands, after he had collected from the crowds that hung upon his lips the amount of alms required for their dowry. He was revered as a prophet and a worker of miracles.†

His sermons, couched in nervous and pithy German, breathe a genuine spirit of practical Christianity, which, although still cramped and confined within the narrow limits of the church

\* *Prædicationes suas, quibus placeret Deo, prodesset populo, sic formabat, ut non esset in curiosis humanæ sapientiæ verbis, sed in spiritu et virtute sermonis, qui civitatis, quæ curiositati potius quam utilitati deserviant, in illo suo vulgari natalis soli proponebat et prosequatur utilia populo, subtilitates questionum scholasticæ disputatione relinquens.* See the already-cited life, c. viii. s. 48. *Mens. Mart. T. I. f. 674.*

† See the accounts in Wadding's *Annalen des Franciskanerordens*, T. IV., at the year 1272; and in the *Chronicle of the Swiss* Johann von Wintherthur. The latter writes concerning him, under the year 1340: *Hic ab hominibus adhuc præsentis tempore extantibus, qui sæpe suis sermonibus interfuerant, mihi et aliis hoc narrantibus, asseritur, habuisse spiritum prophetiæ, nam multa et diversa prædixerat, quæ nostris sunt temporibus adimpleta.* This chronicler states that Berthold, who preached in several other Swiss cities, constantly declined complying with the requests of the citizens of Wintherthur, that he would also come to them, because they refused to do away an impost which was oppressive to the poor. *Vid. Joannis Vitodurani Chronicon, f. vi. et seqq. in the Thesaurus historiæ Helveticæ. Tiguri, 1735.* •

doctrine, yet stood forth in zealous opposition to all the superstition and outside Christianity which merely served as a prop to sin, foretoking the great reformatory tendency which was destined to proceed forth at a future day from German monasticism.\* We will here cite a few of his sayings, in illustration of these remarks. Speaking of the worth of virtue, he says: "While God Almighty created all things for our use, yet there is *one* which, in value and profit, far exceeds all the rest. And therefore you should use all diligence to make sure of this; for he who is without it, never beholds God and his holy angels in their joys and in their glory; and that you may love it as long as you live, I will name it to you: it is called *Virtue*; for the Almighty God is all virtue; and he created men and angels for no other purpose than that we might become partakers of his joys and of his glory. By this virtue, God created angels and men; and as he himself can be nothing other than absolute virtue and pure virtue, so it is his will that angels and men should also be virtuous. But then," says he, "virtue is something other than what the world commonly calls by that name, applying it to him who can gracefully convey a message, carry a dish, or present a cup, and hold or dispose of his hands in a well-bred fashion. Behold! such virtue is mockery in God's sight; for even a dog may be taught to hold up his fore-paws, and to demean himself with a becoming grace."† "Had not our Lady been virtuous," says he soon afterwards,‡ "the Holy Ghost would not have come upon her. Could I but be certain, in this earthly state, that I should never lose the kingdom of heaven, I would rather be a virtuous man upon earth than a saint in heaven, for then I would become progressively holier from day to day and from year to year." He warns his hearers against supposing that a man, by possessing this or that particular virtue, though he may be destitute of the other principal ones, and live in the practice of great sins, is still sure of the kingdom of heaven."

\* Professor F. K. Grieshaber of Rastadt has published German sermons of an unknown person belonging to the thirteenth century, which in language bear considerable resemblance to Berthold's, but in which the moral element is still more predominant. They are marked by a gentle and earnest spirit of sincerity, but want the depth of Berthold.

† In the edition of Kling, p. 186, &c.

‡ P. 188.

“True, one man may possess this, and another that virtue, in a higher degree; but at the same time, all these virtues must be together; for no man can enter the kingdom of heaven if he has not possessed, and does not still possess, all these virtues. Flatter not yourselves on possessing one virtue, or two, or three, or many. Hast thou but a single vice, which is called a capital sin, that settles the question for thee (so wird deiner nimmer Rath).”\* He gives prominence to purity of heart, as the main thing on which everything depends. “He who looks upon a woman,” says he,† “and thinks that he would gladly commit sin with her, has, in God’s sight, already done the deed.” Here, as frequently in his sermons, he interrupts himself with the exclamation: “What! brother Berthold! how many would then be lost!” To which he replies: “Well, suppose thou shouldst find, in thy cellar, a man that has broken open thy chest—though as yet he has purloined nothing from it; what wouldst thou take him to be? Surely, thou wouldst take him to be a thief, and send him to the gallows. Just so God holds thee to be an actual adulterer; for that thou art not so is no fault of thine. Thou art far more, on thy part, God’s thief.”‡ He ever sets forth love as constituting the essence of the Christian temper. Love (die Minne) is one of the most exalted virtues the world ever won; and hence the Almighty God so dearly prizes love, that he has made it the chief ornament of the kingdom of heaven. It is the noble food with which Almighty God will feed us; and therefore should we, on the earth, possess the true love, that we may ever be fed with it in the kingdom of heaven; for there is love beyond love.”§ Having spoken of the fulfilling of the law as consisting in supreme love to God, and in loving our neighbours as ourselves, he says of him who fulfils this law: “I will venture a great word—he has everything that God himself has.|| True love to God consists in this, that thou avoidest all mortal sins, through the regard thou hast to God, therefore sincerely, as if there were neither hell nor devil; and not so much through the fear of hell as through the love thou hast to God.”¶ “Love is like fire,” says he; “whatever is placed in the fire, becomes fire. So is it with love.”\*\* All that

\* P. 140.

¶ P. 4.

† P. 93.

¶ P. 178.

‡ P. 94.

• \*\* P. 156.

§ P. 247.

can befall a man who possesses true love is itself converted into a love. Has he to encounter great toils? It becomes a pleasure of love to him. Has he great poverty? It is the same.\* It seems to many people as if they loved God, while yet they love him not in the way he has bidden. It is a small thing to love God with something else,—with a paternoster, an alms, with a visit to a church, or with a bow towards the altar, or to a picture. Others, who can discourse largely of Christ's sufferings, of God's love and mercy, are wanting in true love.† Learn not even to be an enemy to thine enemies; for it is an eminent sign that one is a child of our heavenly Father, and a pupil of our Lord Jesus Christ, and a dwelling of the Holy Ghost, if he has learned of him to love his enemies, and to carry a gentle heart towards them that have done him ill, and to be peaceful with them that hate peace. What joy has the Holy Ghost over the heart where he finds such constant quiet within. Such sweetness, however, is now rare on the earth; for such meekness we find not in all the world; seldom even with the clergy." In pointing out the distinction between true and false humility, he says: "We may be humble in apparel, in behaviour, in gesture, in words; all this, without possessing humility of heart, as the case is with dissemblers; but the internal humility of the heart cannot remain concealed. It shows itself outwardly in everything; since it cannot appear otherwise than it is. Where it does not appear, there it does not exist in strength." True humility, he said, might be known by this, that they who possess it are willing to hear the same judgment passed upon them which they pass upon themselves. They are willing to be considered as nothing; to be thought sinners; and whatsoever good may be in them, to have God praised for it, from whom it has all proceeded. "It is better," says he,‡ to devour half an ox on Good Friday, than to bewray a soul by falsehood."§

The deep-felt religious need, in connection with the complete formation of the vernacular tongues, had for its result that, in Germany, and in South France, in the Provençal language, various attempts were made to translate the Bible.

\* P. 149.

† P. 106.

‡ P. 89.

§ [It is impossible to give these sayings the quaint simplicity in which they appear in the old German.—TR.]

The effect which, in all times, has accompanied the diffusion of the Scriptures among the people, was observed also in the present case; and it is easy to see how much might have been done for the religious awakening and enlightenment of the people, if such efforts, growing out of the national life and the religious need, had been taken advantage of by the church authorities. The word of God was received with great eagerness by the laity; and from it proceeded a mighty influence on the minds of men. Although the spread of translations of the Bible in the vernacular tongue was certainly not opposed, as yet, by any law, yet the whole church spirit, and the existing relations between priests and laity, could not possibly be inclined to favour the more general circulation of such versions. By the universal use of the Bible, the religious consciousness of the laity would have been withdrawn from its dependence on the tutelage of the church and of the priesthood; and the way would necessarily be prepared thereby for a new evolution. A struggle could not fail to arise, therefore, between the church system and the universal reading of the Scriptures; and even though the persons of highest station in the government of the church by no means entertained at first any intention of limiting the reading of the Scriptures by the laity, yet they would be actually driven to this course by the interest and logical coherence of the system which they wished to maintain. In addition to this, it was especially by means of the sects who stood forth in opposition to the dominant church system that the Bible was once more spread among the laity, whence, with the diligent reading of it, was connected, from the first, a tendency unfavourable to the hierarchy. It is remarkable, that pope Innocent the Third was originally inclined rather to encourage than to suppress the reading of the Bible by the laity, till, influenced by the principles of the church theocracy, of which he was the representative, he was led, by the consequences growing out of that tendency, to contend against it.

By Waldenses, who came from Montpelier,\* translations of the Psalter, of Job, of the epistles of St. Paul, and of several other books of the Bible, in the Provençal language, were spread in the diocese of Metz, and they were eagerly

\* See Cæsarius of Heisterbach, *Distinct.* 5. c. xx. f. 138.

caught up and read by men and women. The light of a religious knowledge, to which their ignorant clergy would have been unable to lead them, here rose upon them. Societies were formed, of men and women, who read the Bible to one another, and were edified thereby: but, as was reported to pope Innocent the Third,\* a certain spiritual pride infected the members of these associations, insomuch that they believed themselves to be the only true Christians, and felt inclined to despise all who took no part in their assemblies. It is, however, quite possible, also, that this charge was brought against them by their adversaries, simply because they maintained, as they might rightly do, that they had a better knowledge of the essence of Christianity than others; and, by their manner of life, ordered according to the doctrine of the Bible, distinguished themselves from the multitude. The priest and parish clergy, it is true, could as yet detect nothing that savoured of heresy in these people; but still they could not be pleased with their effort to make themselves independent of them; and they endeavoured to put a stop to these private meetings. The members of them then met the priests with arguments from the Bible, to show they needed not allow themselves to be forbidden these private means of edification. And several of them assured the ignorant clergy that, in their books, they had what was better than anything they could give them. The bishop of Metz drew up a report of these movements, within his community, for the pope; but the latter was far from wishing to suppress the whole thing, at once, by violent measures. He had undoubtedly learned, from the experience of his predecessors,† how easily such efforts, capable, without doubt, of being made to work in harmony with the church life, and under the supervision of the general church guidance, of proving eminently beneficial, might, by the ecclesiastical despotism which would check every freer movement of the religious spirit, be pushed to an heretical opposition. This pope was well aware, too, that the study of the Bible was better suited than anything else to beget and foster a spiritual bent of piety; he recognized the Bible as furnishing the

\* Lib. II. ep. 141: Qui etiam aspernantur eorum consortium, qui se similibus non immiscent, et a se reputant alienos, qui aures et animos talibus non apponunt.

† See further on.

best means of nourishment for the soul, and the surest remedy for all the disorders of the soul; only he supposed that but few could elevate themselves to this lofty stage; that the majority must content themselves with that union to Christ which came through the medium of sensible things; such, for instance, as the holy eucharist, a medium instituted, indeed, by Christ himself, for the use of all.\* He might, therefore, be rather surprised and rejoiced, than otherwise, to learn that the Bible had, in spite of his doubts, found its way among the laity, and that they derived from it nourishment for their piety, provided nothing was connected therewith which appeared to him fanatical, or calculated to disturb the order of the church. He therefore issued to the bishop and chapter of the cathedral at Metz a letter, to the following import.† “While it is the duty of prelates to keep a careful watch that the heretics may not succeed in laying waste the Lord’s heritage, they should also be extremely cautious how they attempt to gather up the tares before the time of the harvest, lest, perchance, the good fruit may be plucked away also. While no tolerance should be shown to heresy, it was important, also, that no harm should be done to a pious simplicity, lest the simple might be converted into heretics.”‡ He called upon them to admonish these people, and persuade them with arguments, that they should abstain from everything that deserved cen-

\* We gather this from the words of Innocent, in the fourth book of his work, *De mysteriis missæ*, c. xlv. T. I. f. 395. After having mentioned the words at the institution of the sacrament, he says: *Non enim solam scripturarum commemorationem ad hoc sufficere judicabat, qui lethargicum venerat agrotum sanare. Quota namque pars nostri capit illud, quod in evangelio optimis unguentis fragrat, antidotum, verbum quod erat in principio apud Deum, per quem omnia facta sunt quodque caro factum est habitavit in nobis? Nam illud quidem ruminare, medela salubris est, super mel et favum, dulcis faucibus animæ diligentis. Sed tamen cibus valde paucorum est et solius mentis pabulum; quo tunc anima plenissime satiabitur, cum verbum ipsum in æterna felicitate gustabit.* On the other hand, concerning the institution of the Lord’s supper, he says: *Quibus lethargicam mentem ægroti renovata quotidie suæ salutis commemoratione percelleret et edentulam, id est sine dentibus plebem, quæ verbum antiquum et æternum principium quasi solidum cibum ruminare non poterat, hoc dulcissimo confecto liquamine in panis et vini sacramento consuefaceret sorbillare.*

† Lib. II. ep. 142.

‡ Ne in hæreticos de simplicibus commutentur.



sure, and not intrude into matters foreign from their calling. And he required, also, before he proceeded to any further decision on the matter, a more exact report from them, based on careful inquiry, as to the question, who was the author of the translation referred to; by what motives he was led to prepare it; what was the character of the faith of those who used this translation; what had led them to set up themselves as teachers? The pope, by his own conduct, set an example to those who were placed over the communities, teaching them how they ought to proceed with such people; how they ought to place themselves in their point of view, and use passages from the Holy Scriptures themselves, for the purpose of opening their eyes to what was censurable in their conduct, and of leading them away from it.\* A letter, which he himself wrote to these people, was to serve as a pattern for the clergy.† After having explained to them, in detail, what had been reported of them, he declared: "Although the desire of learning how to understand the Holy Scriptures, and of using them for mutual edification, was not to be found fault with, but rather deserved commendation; yet it was a thing not to be approved of, that they should hold their meetings in private; that they should take upon themselves the office of preaching; ridicule the simplicity of the priests, and avoid the society of those who would take no part in their meetings; for that God, who is the true light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world, so abhors the works of darkness, that he gave express command to the apostles, when he sent them forth to preach the gospel to all the world: 'What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops,' Matt. x. 27, whereby he manifestly gives it to be understood that the gospel should be preached, not in secret conventicles, as it is by the heretics, but after the Catholic manner, publicly in the churches." He then, seemingly without design, as though he had no particular reference to them, proceeded to say, "that a special preparatory training was requisite in order to penetrate into the deep things of the sacred Scriptures. For this reason, a particular order had

\* As he himself says: *Revocandi et convincendi secundum scripturas super his, quæ reprehensibilia denotavimus.*

† Ep. 141.

been instituted in the church; and since this had been done, it was not for every one, indiscriminately, to arrogate to himself the office of teacher, but it depended on the fact, whether a man was intrusted with it by the Lord. Should it be affirmed, however, by any one, that God had commissioned him to undertake such a calling in some invisible way, and that such an immediate divine call was superior to any human call, to this person it should be replied: 'As this is a hidden thing, it is not sufficient barely to affirm it, which indeed any false teacher might do concerning himself, but he must prove it, either by a miracle or by some express testimony of Holy Scripture.' No doubt," he says again, "knowledge is pre-eminently necessary for priests, in order that they may be enabled rightly to discharge the office of teachers; yet the more learned ought not to undervalue the less highly educated priests, but always honour in them the priestly vocation." He warned them, moreover, against the pharisaical pride which they would inevitably betray if they looked upon themselves as alone correct, and despised all who did not join their party. Finally, he threatened them with the severity of the church if they would not listen to his paternal admonitions. The reading of the Scriptures, however, had already led these truth-seeking laymen to the knowledge of many errors in the church doctrines. They continued to hold their meetings, in spite of the episcopal prohibition; they refused to give up their translation of the Bible; they declared they would not obey the pope himself, if he should undertake to suppress it. Already several among them avowed, more or less openly, that it was right to obey God rather than men. When this was reported to the pope, by the bishop of Metz, he believed it to be now necessary for him to act with more severity. Still, however, he was unwilling to proceed at once to extreme measures, but preferred, in the first place, to obtain more exact information of the case, and to try milder remedies. Thinking, perhaps, that he could not place entire confidence in the bishop, he commissioned the abbot of Cistercium and three other abbots, in conjunction with the bishop, to investigate the affair, and to examine those people who were to be brought up for trial; a report of all which was to be drawn up and laid before the pope.\* As the result of this examination,

\* Lib. II. ep. 235.

it was found that those separatists professed doctrines which, considered from the position of the church-system, could not appear otherwise than as heresies. A connection was found to exist between them and the sect of the Waldenses, who had long before incurred the condemning sentence of the church. Their assemblies were broken up, and their Bibles committed to the flames. Thus the contest for the dominant church-system, with the sects that fought against it, led to the forcible suppression of the reading of the Bible among the laity ; although no such result was intended at the beginning. A synod at Toulouse, in the year 1229, issued a prohibition of this sort, directed against the translation of the Bible into the spoken language, and the reading of any such translation by laymen.\*

Although religious feeling predominated beyond any other spiritual power in these times, and the supernaturalistic element had diffused itself through the whole spiritual atmosphere, yet, even in this period of a predominating religious tendency, the reactions, which have their ground in the essence of the natural man, and are directed against the principle of faith and the recognition of the supernatural generally, could not be wholly wanting. Even in this period we observe many indications of this reaction that runs through the entire history of humanity ; partly in a distinctly avowed infidelity, and partly in transitory agitations coming up in the form of temptations, and overcome by the power of a triumphant faith. This reaction proceeded from different points ; sometimes it was from that tendency of rude sensuousness which elsewhere, restrained by the superior might of the religious principle, is wont, when it intermingles with the religious feeling itself, to beget superstition ; and then, rebelling against this, its antagonist force leads to the infidelity of brutal natures ; at others it was the worldly culture which began to flourish from the times of the twelfth century, and particularly the speculative bent which set itself in hostility against the faith. Added to this were those influences from without, which

\* C. xiv. : Prohibemus, ne libros veteris testamenti aut novi laici permittantur habere, nisi forte psalterium vel breviarium pro divinis officiis aut horas beatæ Mariæ aliquis ex devotione habere velit. Sed ne præmissos libros habeant in vulgari translatos, arctissime inhibemus.

tended to call forth or to promote such reactions—the influence of the Arabian philosophy from Spain, and of intercourse with the Jews, now widely dispersed among the Christian nations. The emperor Fræderic the Second, and king John Sansterre of England, are to be considered in this regard, not merely as solitary appearances, but as the signs of such tendencies that presented a hostile aspect to the religious principle of the times ; tendencies which recur also under other forms. Thus we find, at the end of the eleventh century, a certain count John of Soissons, who attacked with rude insolence the power of the clergy ; favoured Jews and heretics ; borrowed weapons from the Jews to combat the doctrines of the Christian faith, which he joined with them in ridiculing ; and yet, whether it resulted from hypocrisy and a respect for outward considerations, or from the momentary influence of that religious feeling which was so exceedingly dominant in the spirit of the age, attended church and took part in the acts of worship. “On the Christmas and Easter festivals,” says the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Concy, “he made his appearance at church with such humility, that one could scarcely look upon him as an unbeliever ; and yet he did not hesitate to declare everything that was preached concerning Christ’s passion and resurrection a mere farce.”\* The abbot Guibert, who had a great deal to suffer from this individual, expresses no surprise that a man who called himself a Christian, and who sometimes, though in a mean and stealthy way, visited the churches ; sometimes manifested respect to the altars and priests ; participated in the communion of the faithful and in confession ; adored the crucifix, and sometimes even brought himself to give an alms ;—that such a person should utter blasphemies which the very Jews themselves dared not openly express. A Jewess, with whom the abbot Guibert once spoke concerning him, called it pure insanity that he should first prostrate himself before an image of the Saviour, and then go away and blaspheme him.† This abbot composed a book in defence of the doctrine of the incarnation of the deity, in answer to objections borrowed from the Jews and circulated abroad by the above-mentioned count. The pious bishop Moritz of

\* De vita sua, Lib. III. c. xv.

† Tractat. de incarnatione contra Judæos, c. i.

Paris, well known as a benefactor of the poor and of orphans, desired at his death, which happened in 1196, to testify his faith in a future resurrection, and by his example to confirm in their faith many educated persons, of whom he had been told that they doubted concerning this doctrine.\* For this reason he left it in charge to his friends, that, when his body was exposed to the public view, a card should be laid on his breast, containing the words, "I believe that my Redeemer liveth, and that on the last day I shall arise, and, in my body, behold my Saviour. This testimony of my hope has been laid upon my breast."† This was designed for the learned, who should meet together on the day of his burial. Among the internal conflicts of the faithful, mention is also made of conflicts with the scepticism of the understanding. We have already cited several examples of this kind, in the history of monasticism. In the beginning of the thirteenth century, a young man of a quick and active mind, named Rainer, who had entered the Dominican order, while diligently busying himself, in his monastery of Bruges, in the study of the scholastic theology, and comparing the arguments which might be alleged for and against Christianity, was assailed by a host of doubts. He conversed with Jews, for the purpose of ascertaining what they could say at the position which they occupied, and his doubts grew stronger than ever. His superiors, on observing this, kept him from frequenting the society in which he found nourishment for his doubts; but the forbidden intercourse only became so much the more attractive; the fire which his friends sought to smother burst forth with more violence,‡ and at midnight he fled from the monastery.§

\* Quia resurrectionem corporum, de qua multos peritos tempore suo hæsitantes audierat, firmissime credebatur, cupiens illos ab incredulitate sua etiam moriens revocare.—Rigord. de gestis Philippi, at this year, p. 40.

† Credo, quod redemptor meus vivit et in novissimo die de terra resurrecturus sum et in carne mea videbo salvatorem meum, quem visurus sum ego et non alius et oculi mei conspecturi sunt. Reposita est hæc spes mea in sinu meo.

‡ The Dominican and suffragan bishop of Cambray, Thomas de Cantiprat, who relates this in his *Bonum universale*, or his book *De apibus*, L. II. c. x. says in this connexion: quoniam aretatus ignis acrior consurgit.

§ According to the report of Thomas Cantiprat, he was quieted by a

He afterwards vanquished his doubts, and became still firmer in his faith than ever. That sincerely pious monarch, Louis the Ninth, was no stranger to such assaults of temptation. He exhorted all\* to struggle against them betimes, to attain to steadfastness of faith, in order to be prepared against the final hour, when Satan tries his best to entangle men in scepticism. "We should not rest satisfied," said he, "until we can say to the devil, Away, thou enemy of human nature; thou shalt not be able to deprive me of my settled faith: rather would I consent to part with every limb of my body than to renounce this faith, in which I intend to live and to die. He who does this," he adds, "will foil the enemy at his own weapons."† It was therefore the opinion of the pious monarch,—an opinion which he shared also with the men of these times, rich in Christian experience with regard to all tempting thoughts,—that no admission should be allowed to such thoughts, when they arose involuntarily; but the soul should surrender itself more entirely to the faith, and, in the assurance of this, despise them. To confirm this advice, the king quoted a saying which he had heard from the lips of one of the distinguished theologians of this period, bishop William of Paris (or of Auvergne). A respectable teacher of theology once came to him in quest of spiritual counsel; but before he could state his case, he fell into a violent fit of weeping. The bishop then bespoke him in words of comfort, and said, "Despair not, for no man can be so great a sinner as to exceed God's ability to forgive him his sins." Whereupon the man laid open his doubts respecting the doctrine of the eucharist, which he considered a temptation of Satan. The bishop asked him whether he found pleasure in these doubts? and when the man who was troubled with them assured him that his faith was more precious to him than all the wealth in the world, and that he would rather suffer one limb after another to be severed from his living body than to deny the least article in it,—the bishop

vision of the Virgin Mary, and induced to return back to his monastery. Some occurrence of a psychological nature may, perhaps, lie at the bottom of this story, but what it was it is impossible to make out from the isolated facts reported to us.

\* See Joinville, L. c. p. 177.

† Qui ainsi le fait, il vainqt l'ennemy du baton dont l'ennemy le vouloit occire.

proposed to him the following question : " Suppose our king to be at war with the king of England, and that he had intrusted to each of us two the defence of a citadel ; to you, one situated on the frontier, and exposed to the greatest danger ; to me, one in the centre of the country, — to which of us would he feel the most thankful ? " And the theologian being obliged to reply, " To the former, " — the bishop resumed : " My mind, disturbed by no doubts, is to be compared with that second citadel ; yours, which amid so many conflicts remains true to the faith, is like the first. Surely then, your condition is of greater account in the eye of God than mine ; only trust in him, and be assured that, wherever it is needful, he will help you. "

There was a dead faith of the worldly heart, which had adopted a form, to the power of which it was a stranger, as a mere matter of tradition ; and which was preserved free from all doubts, simply by reason of its indifference to all the objects of faith. To persons of this stamp it could hardly fail to happen, that, with an awakening interest in these objects, doubts also would start into being ; and these doubts might sometimes prove a necessary point of transition to true faith. A tendency of this sort is described by that profound observer of the secret workings of the soul, Hugo a Sancto Victore, where he is describing a class of men\* whose faith consisted in nothing else than merely taking care not to contradict the faith ; men who were called believers, rather from the custom of a life passing under the outward guise of Christianity, than from any power of faith : † " for with their eyes ever fixed on the perishable, they never elevate their souls to that degree as to think on futurity ; and though they unite with other believers, in partaking of the sacraments of the Christian faith, still they never ask themselves why a man is a Christian, or what is the hope of future good among Christian men. Although such persons pass under the name of believers, yet, in reality and truth, they are at a great distance from faith," ‡

\* De sacramentis fidei, p. x. Lib. I. c. iv. ed. Venet. 1588, T. II. f. 257.

† Quibus credere est solum fidei non contradicere, qui consuetudine vivendi magis quam virtute credendi fideles nominantur.

‡ Re et veritate longe sunt a fide.

or, as he remarks in another place : \* “ Men who live as they have been born would, had they been born elsewhere, be no believers at all.” † And with such, he believed it a sign of the first visitation of divine grace, when they were aroused to consider for what man was born ; whether another life followed the present ; and whether there were rewards for the good and punishments for the wicked. Thus, it was only the doubts that filled their consciences with alarm, when they contemplated the uncertainty of human life, that awakened in them, according to Hugo, the longing after the knowledge of the truth. The abbot Peter of Cluny heard that a great number—as he had reason to suspect, of the monks around him—had expressed doubts whether Christ had anywhere in the gospels called himself God. They had, therefore, carefully examined them, and could arrive at no satisfactory conclusion. The abbot Peter did not ask after their names ; nor did he allow himself to draw any hasty inferences from the doubts which they expressed. He took it for granted they had not fallen away from their faith, but were only inquiring after the truth, and seeking instruction. Lest, however, this suspense and hesitation should lead to scepticism with regard to the doctrine itself,—of Christ’s divinity,—he composed a tract, the object of which was to prove that Christ bore witness to his own divinity, by the manner in which he spoke of himself.

The religious feelings of the multitude, lively in their character, but quite exposed to be alloyed by a rude sensuousness, easily betrayed them into fanatical extravagances ; and although, as we have seen, voices of commanding influence were not wanting to guide to the spiritual apprehension of divine things, and to warn against everything fanatical and superstitious, yet, the men of this spirit were too few to exert a sufficient degree of influence on the masses, and the greater number of incompetent or badly disposed ecclesiastics and monks contributed by their influence to promote the evils which they ought to have averted. Hence, the wide and rapid spread of so many excrecent growths of fanaticism

\* Miscellan. Lib. I. tit. xviii. f. 47.

† Qui ita vivunt, ut nati sunt, qui si in alio nati essent, fideles non essent.



and superstition,—one case of which we have in saint-worship. Men who, by their lives, by their deeds and words, had made a powerful impression on the religious feelings of the people, were easily made the objects of an extravagant veneration; and it was necessary for them to be at every pains to put a check to it, lest it might reach the point of idolatry. At the tomb of some such individual vast numbers would soon be found assembled for the purpose of prayer; the heightened devotion; the excited state of the imagination, were capable of producing remarkable effects on soul and body; exaggerating report magnified the facts, and thus stories of the miraculous cures that had been performed at such tombs spread far and wide; and an ever-increasing multitude of people, moved by devotion, curiosity, or the hope of succour, were attracted to the spot. While some, carried away by this general enthusiasm for the memory of the departed saint, gave countenance to such movements among the people, many sensible bishops and abbots thought it necessary to adopt precautionary measures, lest fanaticism or fraud should take advantage of these tumultuous exhibitions of religious feeling; in doing which, however, they were always liable to injure the reputation of their piety.\* The attempt forcibly to suppress such exhibitions by outward measures, instead of accomplishing its object, was apt to lead to exactly the contrary result. Many tombs became celebrated for the miraculous cures which were performed at them, through reports, the foundation of which could never be ascertained; and thus many a dead man, probably, attained to the honour of a saint who was far from deserving it. Ignorance, credulity, and fraud would contribute, in some degree, to multiply the number of saints. When Lanfranc was created archbishop of Canterbury, he was surprised to find that many were honoured as saints, in England, respecting whom no reason could be given why they deserved

\* After the death of the abbot Walter of Melrose, in Scotland (A.D. 1160), his successor, William, published an order forbidding the sick to flock to his tomb; but he exposed himself thereby to the reproach of envy or of arrogance, as if he had presumed to set limits to the divine grace. The author of the life of the former abbot observes: *Videtur pluribus hujusmodi prohibitionem præsumptuosam nimis esse, ut homo luteo tabernaculo circumdatus misericordiæ fontem audeat obstruere, et gloria cælesti clarificatum mundoque miraculis manifestatum sub cespite silentii præsumat obstruere.* Mens. August, T. I. f. 274.

that honour. To the number of these belonged, in particular, Elfeg archbishop of Canterbury, slain by the Normans in 1012, who was worshipped as a saint and a martyr. Lanfranc did not think he ought to be regarded as a martyr,—for he had not died in confessing the Christian faith,—but had been slain, when a prisoner among the Normans, simply because he refused to pay the sum demanded for his ransom. Having stated the case to Anselm, while the latter was on a visit to him in England, Anselm endeavoured to show that the aforesaid archbishop deserved beyond question to be regarded as a martyr; “for,” said he, “a man who chooses rather to die than to dishonour God by the slightest sin would surely hesitate still less to sacrifice his life rather than provoke the divine displeasure by a more grievous transgression. And so that archbishop Elfeg, who chose rather to die than to redeem his life at the expense of his community, would assuredly not have shrunk from death if he had been commanded to deny Christ. And besides, what else was meant by dying for justice or for truth, than dying for Christ, who is justice and truth?”\* Anselm himself was afterwards obliged, however, to declare against a saint-worship of this sort, for which no due reasons were assigned.† How easily the reputation of a saint might be acquired among the people, appears from an example cited by the abbot Guibert. It was quite sufficient for this purpose, among the country-people of France, that the squire of a knight should have died on Good Friday. The peasants of the district, eager after novelties, brought gifts and wax-tapers to his tomb; a house was erected over it, and country-pilgrims flocked to it from afar. Wonderful stories were spread abroad, and mixed with the rest was a plentiful share of imposture. Avarice, taking advantage of the credulity of the people, led people first to feign themselves sick, and then to be healed by the pretended saint.‡ The abbot of

\* See the life of Lanfranc, by his disciple, Milo-Crispin, in the *Actis Sanctorum*, Ord. Benedicti of Mabillon, s. 37, sæc. vi. p. ii. f. 654.

† He threatened an abess, who favoured such worship, with suspension. See his letter, L. IV. ep. 10.

‡ The abbot Guibert, *De pignoribus sanctorum*, Lib. I. c. ii. s. 5: *In profani vulgi avaris pectoribus capi potuerunt fictitiæ surditates, affectuæ vesaniæ, digiti studio reciprocati ad volam, vestigia contorta sub clunibus.*

the monastery within whose territory was the spot where these things transpired was forgetful enough of his duty to connive at these impostures for the sake of the gain.\* Unprincipled monks pushed a lucrative trade with fictitious relics, in extolling the virtues of which they spared no lies.† Processions with relics were got up with a view to collect money for the rebuilding of a church; and the clergy, who cried up, in mountebank-fashion, their various virtues, pretended, without blushing, to show in a casket the bread which our Lord himself had touched with his teeth. Every village was anxious to have its own guardian saints. Thus false legends of saints sprang up among the people. The clergy tolerated this; and so these legends, passing from mouth to mouth, continually gained credence; and among the populace, who ever presumed to lisp a syllable against them was accounted an enemy of piety, and provoked against himself the popular fury.‡ In opposition to these abuses of the worship of saints and relics, the abbot Guibert of Nogent sous Coucy wrote his work *De Pignoribus Sanctorum*, in four books. He called it a grievous sin that men should think of glorifying God by falsehoods. He accused those who spread abroad stories of miracles, of making God a liar.§ He detected one source of the abuse in what he considered the unnatural practice of removing the bodies of holy men from the earth in which they reposed, and of distributing and carrying about their separated members in costly settings.|| He declared it unbecoming that the body of the disciple should be honoured above that of the Master; that while Christ was buried beneath the stone, the members of his disciples should be

\* As Guibert says: *Munerum comportatorum blandiente frequentia infecta miracula fieri supportabat.*

† The work above cited, L. c. s. 6.

‡ Guibert, Lib. I. c. iii. s. 1. After having spoken of the ancient, approved saints, he adds: *Cum enim alii alios summos conspicerent habere patronos, voluerunt et ipsi quales potuerunt facere suos. Tacente clero anus et muliercularum vilium greges talium patronorum commentatas historias post insubulos et litiatoria cantitant, et si quis earum dicta refellat, pro defensione ipsorum non modo convitiis, sed telorum radiis instant.*

§ Lib. I. c. ii. s. 5: *Qui Deo quod nequidem cogitavit adscribit, quantum, in se est, Deum mentiri cogit.*

|| Cap. iv. s. 1: *Certe si sanctorum corpora sua juxta naturæ debitum loca, i. c. sepulchra servassent, hujusmodi errores vacassent.*

denied the earth from which they originally came, to be preserved in gold, silver, precious stones, and silks.\* He protested especially against the carrying about the so-called relics of the body of Christ. It was only by spiritual communion that men should now rise upward to Christ. Christ communicated himself under the figure of the bread and wine in the supper, in order that the faithful might have their minds withdrawn from the things of sense. He refers to Christ's words, addressed to his disciples (John xvi. 7), that the Holy Ghost would not come to them till he was no longer sensibly present before their eyes. "Those who pretend to show such relics," says he, "contradict this word of truth. For what does Christ say? The Holy Spirit will not come if his own bodily presence be not first withdrawn from men, because, unless the sight of everything bodily be withdrawn, the soul will not rise to the faith of contemplation. For the exercise and trial of our faith, our Lord would lead us away from his proper to his mystical body; and thus should we progressively mount upward to the spiritual contemplation of the divine essence."†

Particularly did that tendency of devotion which manifested itself in paying honours to the Virgin Mary, in whom men adored the mother of our Saviour, and the ideal of the virgin-life, rise continually to a higher pitch, and lead onward to wilder extravagances. For a long time, already, the opinion had gained currency that she ought to be excepted from the number of human beings under the taint of corruption; that by a special operation of grace she had been preserved immaculate from all sin. But now, many were led, on the same principle, to take still another step, and to maintain that the Virgin Mary came into the world wholly free from original sin. Therefore, many began already to set apart for this glorification of the Virgin Mary a particular festival,—the festi-

\* *Ut discipulus præponatur magistro? Ille lapidi intrudatur, hic auro claudatur? Ille nec plene sindone subtili involvatur, hic palliis aut sericis aurove textili succingatur?*

† *Lib. II. c. vi. s. 4: Nisi, quicquid corporeum ipsius est, a memoria abrogetur, ad contemplandi animus fidem nullatenus sublevatur. Ad exercitationem fidei nostræ, a principali corpore ad mysticum Dominus noster nos voluit traducere, et exinde quasi quibusdam gradibus ad divinæ subtilitatis intelligentiam erudire.*

val of the Immaculate Conception. But voices of influence and authority protested against such an innovation, and the dogma lying at the bottom of it. Canonicals of the church at Lyons having introduced such a festival, Bernard of Clairvaux declared himself decidedly opposed to it.\* “On the same principle,” he wrote to them, “you would be obliged to hold that the conception of her ancestors, in an ascending line, was also a holy one; since otherwise she could not have descended from them after a worthy manner,—and there would be festivals without number.† But such a frequent celebration of festivals was appropriate only to our final home in heaven; it was unsuitable to a life, far from our true home, like this upon the earth. We ought not to attribute to Mary that which belongs to one Being alone,—to him who can make all holy,—and, being himself free from sin, purify others from it. Besides him, all who have descended from Adam must say of themselves that which one of them says in the name of all (Psalm li. 5)—‘In sin did my mother conceive me.’” The controversy concerning the festival of the Immaculate Conception, and the dogma therewith connected, spread also through England and Germany. It was the monks who contended for it; but there were monks also who combated it. Potho, a monk and priest in the monastery of Prüm in the province of Triers, who wrote, after the middle of the twelfth century, a work ‘On the Condition of the House of God,’‡ combated, among many other innovations introduced by the monks, this festival as the most absurd of all.§ In evidence of the continued controversy on this subject, we have the letters relating to it which passed, in the latter times of the twelfth century, between the abbot de la Celle, afterwards bishop of Chartres, and Nicholas, an English monk. The former maintained, as Bernard had done, that Mary was born with the tinder, the inflammable material, of sin,—lust, warring against reason; but that she was preserved, through the power of grace, from all the excitements of temptation, till at length, after the birth of Christ, she attained to a per-

\* Ep. 173.

† De avis et proavis id ipsum posset pro simili causa quilibet flagitare et sic tenderetur in infinitum et festorum non esset numerus.

‡ In the Bibl. patr. Lugd. T. XXI.

§ Quod magis absurdum videtur, at the end of the third book.

fect exemption from the same.\* He inveighed against the chimeras of the English.† But the monk Nicholas looked upon that which the abbot de la Celle had said concerning the conflict which lasted in Mary until the conception, as a disparagement of her dignity, and felt himself bound to stand forth in its defence. Although he honoured Bernard as a saint, yet he believed that even he, like other holy men, might err on such a single point. He appealed, in proof of this, to the legend concerning an appearance of Bernard after his death.‡ Such visions, often susceptible of a very easy explanation, were, as it seems, at this period sometimes resorted to as a divine testimony to the truth; and Humbert de Romanis, general of the Dominicans, in his work above cited,§ denounces those who, instead of adducing texts of Scripture and passages from the fathers, appealed to uncertain dreams and visions for the purpose of defending innovations, to whom he applied the saying of the prophet Hosea (chapter xiii.). || In like manner, Peter de la Celle declared, in this particular case: I believe, respecting her, the gospel, and not dreams; and if I am in any way wrong, God will reveal this also, in the time and way he pleases.”¶ The monk Nicholas ap-

\* Lib. VI. ep. 23: Quod sæva libidinis incentiva Deo præoperante nunquam senserit vel ad modicum. Cætera vero impedimenta humanæ fragilitatis, quæ naturali origine de natura procedunt, ante divinam conceptionem sentire potuit, sed nullatenus consensit. Præveniente siquidem gratia fomes peccati anhelando supremum spiritum duxit, until this *fomes* was wholly destroyed through the operation of the Holy Spirit at the conception.

† Nec indignetur Anglia levitas, si ea solidior sit Gallica maturitas. Certe expertus sum, somniores plus esse Anglicos quam Gallos.

‡ See his letter, L. IX. ep. 9: In Claravallensi collegio quidam conversus bene religiosus in visu noctis vidit Abbatem Bernardum niveis indutum vestibus quasi ad mamillam pectoris furvam habere maculam. And when he was asked, why?—he replied: Quia de Domine nostræ conceptione scripsi non scribenda, signum purgationis meæ maculam in pectore porto. The vision was committed to writing, and the document laid before the chapter-general, but it was burnt, maluitque Abbatum universitas virginis periclitari gloriam S. Bernardi opinione.

§ De eruditione prædicatorum, Lib. II. in the section concerning councils.

|| Alii sunt, qui innitentes quibusdam visionibus et somniis incertis intendunt propter illa aliquid ordinare, cum tamen sensus et intentio sanctorum ac tantorum virorum sint hujusmodi phantasiis omnino præponenda.

¶ Lib. IX. ep. 10: Evangelio non somniis de illa credo, et si aliter

pealed, moreover, to the fact of a progressive development of the church, which may even introduce innovations for the necessities of devotion.\* But the abbot de la Celle maintained that any such new institution should proceed regularly from the church of Rome and a general council. He protested against the innovating caprice of individuals. This controversy was continued into the thirteenth century, and passed into the following periods. The antagonists of this extravagant veneration of Mary gained a very important voice on their side, when Thomas Aquinas stood forth as an opponent of that opinion, offering, as an argument against it, that the honour due to Christ alone would thereby suffer injury, inasmuch as he must be acknowledged to be the Saviour of all men, whom all needed in order to be freed from original sin.† As he saw very clearly that nothing could be adduced from Holy Scripture concerning the conception and birth of Mary, he was of the opinion that no decision was to be arrived at here, except on grounds of reason and analogy. From these, then, it might be argued that since on Mary, as the mother of Christ, was conferred greater favour than on any other human being,—and since a Jeremiah, a John the Baptist, enjoyed the peculiar privilege of being sanctified from the womb, a like privilege must be attributed also to her. Hence, it might be, that, although original sin existed in her, as a nature,‡ yet, through the grace imparted to her before her birth, and through the divine providence which accompanied her afterwards through her entire life, this inherited nature was so restrained, that no motion contrary to reason could proceed therefrom. Thus might that, which was potentially present in her, be, notwithstanding, always restrained from any actual putting forth, and thereupon, after the conception of Christ, might follow a perfect exemption, in her case, from all original sin, even in its potential being; which exemption was

sapio, et hoc ipsum revelabit Deus, quando voluerit et quomodo voluerit.

\* Nonne eodem spiritu potantur moderni, quo et antiqui? Non erat ab initio nativitas virginis in ecclesia solennis, sed crescente fidelium devotione addita est præclaris ecclesiæ solennitatibus. Quare igitur non similiter et diem conceptionis obtineat sedulitas Christianæ devotionis?

† Hoc derogaret dignitati Christi, secundum quam est universalis omnium Salvator.

‡ The fomes peccati.

transferred to her from her Son, as the universal Redeemer.\* This cautious reserve of the considerate Thomas Aquinas, a man who was in the habit of relying more on the declarations of Scripture than on human conjectures, was a quality of which Raymund Lull, with his bold flights of fancy and speculation, was altogether incapable. Among the necessary prerequisites, in order to Mary's becoming the organ for the incarnation of the Son of God, he reckoned this, that she should be exempt not only from all actual, but also from all original sin: for God and sin could not come together in the same subject.† The Holy Spirit had so wrought within her to prepare the way by her sanctification for the incarnation of the Son of God, as the sun by the dawn prepares the way for the day.‡

As the festival of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin grew out of that peculiar turn of devotion that originated in the monasteries, the same was the case likewise with another festival, which afterwards came to be very generally observed. It may easily be conceived that the mystical, contemplative bent of the monkish spirit would first lead to the creation of a festival distinguished from other Christian festivals by the absence of all reference to historical facts; and such was that of the Trinity.§ Yet, if there was something in the Christian consciousness that resisted the introduction of a festival of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, there was, on the other hand, an appropriateness in a festival of the Trinity, constituting, as it were, a sort of terminus to the entire cycle of festivals in the year, which would recommend it to general acceptance, and gradually overcome the objections which

\* *Credendum est, quod ex prole redundaverit in matrem totaliter fomite subtracto.*

† *Nisi beata virgo fuisset dispesita, quod filius Dei de ipsa assumeret carnem, scilicet quod non esset corrupta nec in aliquo peccato sive actuali sive originali, filius Dei non potuisset ab ipsa assumere carnem, cum Deus et peccatum non possunt concordari in aliquo subjecto.*

‡ *Sic præparavit viam incarnationis per sanctificationem, sicut sol-diem per auroram.* In Lib. II. sent. Quæst. 96, T. IV. opp. f. 84.

§ The monk Potho of Prüm, near the end of the third book of his work *De statu domus Dei*, mentions the introducing of this festival also among the *repentinis novitatibus in ecclesiasticis officiis*, which innovations he traces to the *juvenilis levitas*, by which the *vita monastica* had allowed itself to be vitiated.



might be raised on the ground of innovation. For it corresponded with the relation of the doctrine of the Trinity to the sum total of Christian consciousness, that, as this doctrine has for its presupposition the full development of all that is contained in this consciousness, and the Christian consciousness of God arrives, therein, at a statement that exhausts the whole subject-matter; so a festival having reference to this doctrine would form the terminus of the cycle of festivals, commencing with Christ's nativity; and if this festival grew, in the first place, out of the significance which the doctrine of the Trinity had gained for the speculative and mystical theology of these times, yet this solemnity obtained a position, in the entire cycle of church festivals, which was calculated to direct attention to the original and essential significance of this doctrine.

As the customs and amusements usually connected with the pagan festivals of December and January had, in spite of every attempt to suppress them, still continued to be observed among Christians, both in the East and the West,\* and had attached themselves to the celebration of the Christian festivals in these months,—as, for example, to the festival of Christ's circumcision, which was directly opposed to the pagan celebration of January,—so, in many districts, these customs gradually led to the practice of sportively travestying the offices and rites of the church,—a natural accompaniment of sensuous devotion,—as in the *festum fatuorum, follorum, hypodiaconorum*; abuses which, notwithstanding the various ordinances made in order to suppress them, continued afterwards to spread even more widely.†

We have, in the preceding periods, seen how it came to pass that the idea of the sacraments, understood at first so indefinitely as holy symbols, came to be restricted to a certain series of ecclesiastical transactions; and the practice of the church had already given sanction to the hypothesis that these sacraments were all comprised under the sacred

\* Forbidden by the sixty-second canon of the second Trullan council, A.D. 691, directed against maskings and comical processions: Μηδένα ἄνδρα γυναικίαν σπολὴν ἐνδιδύσκεισθαι ἢ γυναῖκα τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἁρμόδιον· ἀλλὰ μήτε προσωπίδια κωμικά ἢ σατυρικά ἢ τραγικά ὑποδύσθαι.

† Whoever would like to know more on this subject may consult Gieseler's Manual of Church History, Vol. II. s. ii. p. 436, and ff. 2nd ed.

number *seven*. It only remained that various other holy signs, to which it had also been customary to apply the name of sacraments,\* should be excluded, and the number seven more distinctly fixed. This was done in the present period, when the idea of the sacrament came to be more exactly and sharply defined by scientific theology. In the instructions given, by bishop Otto of Bamberg, to persons newly baptized, in the year 1124,† the determinate number of seven sacraments is mentioned for the first time. He wished to leave behind him, he said, for the new converts, from whom he was about to separate, these seven sacraments as the pledge, given by our Lord, of his fellowship with the church, in order that, amid the labours and conflicts of the present life, they might not faint and be discouraged.‡ The scientific theology of this century now sought to prove the internal necessity of this determinate number of the sacraments. It was customary to ascribe to them a twofold efficiency,—one positive, to prepare men for the whole duty of the Christian worship of God; the other negative, to meet and oppose the reactions of sin. At bottom lay the Christian idea, that the present earthly life should, in all its relations, be consecrated and sanctified by religion: and that the spiritual, in like manner with the bodily life, should have its own proper stages of development.§ The peculiar form of the religious spirit, in these times, craved, however, for everything, some medium of sensuous representation; and this was not to be a mere symbol, but must be objectively manifested, as the actual bearer of divine powers. Thus, in the first place, the birth to a spiritual life is represented by baptism; next, growth to maturity, by confirmation; finally, nutriment, in order to the preservation of the life and strength, by the Lord's supper. This would suffice, were not man subject, in his bodily and spiritual life, to manifold defects and disturbances. Diseases require their appropriate remedies.

\* Thus we find the number twelve mentioned by Damiani.

† See section i. p. 8.

‡ *Septem sacramenta ecclesiar, quasi septem significativa dona Spiritus sancti, quibus intendendo in laboribus et certamine hujus vitæ non deficere.* Canisii lect. antiq., ed. Basnage, T. III. p. ii. f. 62. To be sure, the chronological date of the first mention of this number seven is uncertain; as we cannot vouch for the accuracy of the report.

§ See, for example, the unfolding of this view by Thomas Aquinas.

Answering to the recovery of health, is penance; to the promotion of convalescence, by means of appropriate diet and exercise, the extreme unction. Furthermore, as man belongs, both in a physical and spiritual sense, to some society, so the efficiency of the sacraments must extend, also, to this relation: thus ordination and marriage obtain their appropriate place. We have seen how the consciousness of a real communion with Christ in the Lord's supper assumed, in the all-absorbing supernaturalist element of this age, the form of a doctrine of transubstantiation; and how this notion, so firmly established in the whole mode of intuition peculiar to these centuries, could not fail, to obtain the victory for it, over the modes of apprehension belonging to other habits and bents of mind. Accordingly, this doctrine was definitively settled for the church, at the Lateran council, in 1215.\* The doctrine of transubstantiation being definitively settled, it must be followed by the determination that, after the miracle produced by the consecration, the "accidents" of bread and wine, without the subject, still remained; and a determination of this sort, though involving a contradiction in language, was still the best suited, at this particular point of view, to avoid such expressions of a gross and fleshly materialism as we saw employed by the zealots opposed to Berengar, as well as the fantastical Docetic notion, that everything of a sensuous nature which took place at the Lord's supper was only an appearance without reality. In fact, the particular mode, after which the matter then presented itself to religious intuition, is, in this form, simply *objectized*: for this mode of religious intuition, everything sensible was purely an accident; the *essential* thing for it was, simply the body of Christ, veiled under this figure. In this mode of intuition, the whole theocratico-ecclesiastical point of view, the whole mediæval form of apprehending Christianity, was brought to a completion. The miracle of transubstantiation appeared as the ever-repeated miracle of all miracles, the act of the greatest self-humiliation of the deity.† It was the very

\* Transsubstantiat panis in corpus Christi potestate divina.

† As Raymund Lull, for example, in his glowing style of devotion, expresses it: Fuit unquam ullum mirabile vel ulla humilitas, quæ cum ipso possit comparari, quod panis et vinum deveniant in tuam sanctam humanitatem, quæ est unita cum deitate et quod tuum corpus adeo nobile se permittat manducari et tractari ab homine peccatore misero?

Christ, who, under this sensible veil, presented himself to believing devotion; and the lively faith excited by the view of that Host, which was only the veil of Christ, might produce powerful effects.\* Here was shown the high dignity of the Christian priesthood, that constantly served as the organ of this miracle of miracles, by means of which this utmost realization of the union of heaven and earth could be brought about, the very end and aim of all worship; but precisely for the reason that this dogma constituted the central and the highest point of the whole mode of intuition that governed the religious consciousness of these centuries, those who, in their modes of thinking, were opposed to the Catholic view, manifested a peculiar hostility to it, as we may perceive in the attacks against the church doctrines by the sects, and in the doubts and temptations with which ecclesiastics had to contend;† and contemplating such phenomena in their connection with the times, we may doubtless affirm that to many, who, with their religious life, belonged wholly to this standing point of intuition, and who were incapable of apprehending Christianity in any other form, it was in fact a trial under which their faith in the supernatural must either be able to preserve itself, or else must succumb to that reaction of the mere understanding that discards everything supernatural. With others, it was, no doubt, the reaction of a freer and purer evangelical bent of the spirit; and this would, in the case of some, yield to the superior power of the dominant church spirit, while in others it proceeded to the point of an actual breach.

\* This may be illustrated by the case of William archbishop of Bourges, who, in the last struggles of death, seeing the Host approach, raised himself from his couch, and, filled with awe and enthusiastic faith, advanced with a firm and vigorous step to meet his Lord, and prostrated himself, with tears, before him. The incident is thus related in the language of the times: *Ut autem Dominum creatorem suum ad se venisse cognovit, illico resumptis viribus, de strato prosiiliens, tanquam febris omnis abscississet, non sine stupore circumstantium, maxime quod jam fere in supremo spiritu positus videretur, et vix aliquid liquoris posset in os admittere, concito gradu procedit, vires certe subministrante caritate flexisque genibus, totus lacrimis diffluens, illum adorat.* See the above-cited life, c. viii, s. 29. Mens. Januar. T. I. f. 634.

† To the same cause may be referred, also, the doubts by which an ecclesiastic was annoyed, who complained of his distress to bishop William of Paris. See above, p. 452.

The latter may have been the case with that ecclesiastic of whom St. Bernard speaks, in his life of the archbishop Malachias of Armagh.\* There was a certain man of good intellectual endowments, who refused to recognize in the eucharist the true body of Christ, but looked upon it as only a means of spiritual communion with Christ, whereby one is advanced in holiness.† The bishop, after having tried in vain by private conversations to convince him of his error, called together a meeting of the clergy, before which the denier of the doctrine of transubstantiation was summoned to appear. The matter was here discussed with him, and the judgment of all present went against him. He still persisted, however, in his opinion, affirming that he was not overcome by arguments, but put down by the authority of the bishop. Respect to the person of no man, he said, should prevail upon him to forsake the truth. It is then stated that, soon afterwards falling into a mortal sickness, he was led to seek reconciliation with the church. The report which has come down to us respecting this matter is not, however, sufficiently exact to enable us to determine from it what were the actual facts. Abelard intimates that the question concerning the Lord's supper belonged, in his day, among those which were yet *sub lite*.‡ We learn from another report,§ that there were still in the twelfth century many who condemned Berengar, without being at a very wide remove from his doctrines. They supposed that, by a metonymy, conformable to the biblical usage of language,—by which the name of a thing was transferred to what represented it,—the consecrated bread might be denominated the body of Christ; and they pronounced Berengar to be wrong only in that he had so openly expressed an opposite view to the common church representation, and thus given occasion of offence to

\* Cap. 26.

† Sacramentum et non rem sacramenti, id est solam sanctificationem et non corporis veritatem.

‡ Sed nec adhuc illam summam controversiam de sacramento altaris, utrum videlicet panis ille, qui videtur, figura tantum sit dominici corporis, an etiam veritas substantiæ ipsius dominicæ carnis, fuem accepisse, certum est. Theol. Christian. L. IV. Martene et Durand. thesaur. anecdotor. T. V. f. 1315.

§ That of Zacharias bishop of Chrysopolis (Scutari), in his Commentary on the four gospels, L. IV., c. clvi. Bibl. patr. Lugd. T. XIX. f. 916.

many.\* As the free spirit of inquiry, encouraged by the dialectic theology, called forth many antagonisms, so, among the rest, there seem to have been some who† appealed to the sayings of the old church-fathers, particularly of Augustin, in defence of a similar opinion to that of Berengar.‡ And that mystic himself, who with so much warmth and earnestness defended the faith in the true reality of the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist, still,—when he wished to say that the miracle here wrought by the Holy Ghost was one which remained hidden from the perception of the senses, and produced no alteration in the sensuous emblems,—was driven to make an assertion at variance with the doctrine of transubstantiation, namely, the following: that it was the manner of the Holy Ghost, not to destroy the nature of a thing, but to appropriate it as the bearer of higher powers,—not to remove the existing substance, but to raise it to a higher potency.§ Were one to apply a principle of this sort with logical consistency to the doctrine in question, he would be carried back—as Rupert, using the same comparison also observes—to the older hypothesis, that the union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine was to be conceived as similar to the union of the two natures in Christ; and among the different views which at that time were still held forth respecting the doctrine of the Lord's supper, one of this sort actually made its appearance.|| As the doctrine of transubstantiation

\* Sunt nonnulli, imo forsani multi, sed vix notari possunt (they cannot easily be noticed, because they conceal their real opinions), qui cum damnato Berengario idem sentiunt, et tamen eundem cum ecclesia damnant. In hoc videlicet damnant eum, quia formam verborum ecclesie abjiciens, nuditate sermonis scandalum movebat. Non sequebatur, ut dicunt, usum scripturarum, quæ passim res significantes tanquam significatas appellant.

† Rupert of Deutz says of them: Quid dicemus magnis et magnificis parvulorum magistris, quibus interdum suavius redolet Platonis academia, quam hæc vivifica Domini mensa? Commentar. in Joann. L. VI. T. II. f. 308. Ed. Paris, 1638.

‡ He says of them: Ubi totius viribus intenti ad expugnandam veritatem dominici corporis et sanguinis magnorum sententias doctorum attulerint.

§ Spiritus sancti affectus non est, destruere vel corrumpere substantiam, quamcunque suos in usus assumit, sed substantiæ bono permanenti quod erat, invisibiliter adjicere, quod non erat. Commentar. in Exod. L. II. c. x. T. I. f. 171.

|| Among these different opinions which the scholastic writer, Alger

had proceeded from the one-sided supernaturalist element which governed the minds of that period, so it operated back again also, in promoting and encouraging the same particular bent. Hence, the deification of outward symbols which now prevailed; these symbols being made,—even independent of the whole sacred rite, and of the end which it was designed to subserve,—objects of superstitious veneration; which, to be sure, was not first called forth by this article of doctrine, but had its foundation laid long before in that externalization of the religious feelings, which led to the supposition of a supernatural power adhering to the sensuous element. In order consistently to maintain the doctrine of transubstantiation, and to give up nothing on the side of the objective, it was assumed, that, so long as the emblems of the bread and wine—perceivable to the senses—were present, so long, in the same manner, as the *substance* of both was before contained under these emblems, the *Body of Christ* was now present, veiled under the same;\* and accordingly, it was necessary to infer that, if a mouse or a dog should nibble the consecrated host, the substance of Christ's body still did not, on that account, cease to be there. Thomas Aquinas was of the opinion that this by no means tended to lower the dignity of Christ's body; since, in fact, he had, without any lowering of his dignity, suffered himself to be crucified by sinners; especially, considering it was not the body of Christ, according to its proper essence, but only in respect to these outward emblems, under which it was veiled in the sacrament, that was thereby affected.† We see here the most extreme point of realistic externalization to which the interest to retain the objective side unimpaired could bear to be pushed; and that which was expounded by Thomas Aquinas with a refined and cautious species of

of Liege, cites in the preface to his book written in defence of the doctrine of transubstantiation, *De sacramento corporis et sanguinis Domini*, we find also this: *In pane Christum quasi imparatum, sicut Deum in carne personaliter incarnatum.* Bibl. patr. Ludg. T. XXI. f. 251.

\* Quod defertur corpus Christi, quousque species defertur.

† Nec hoc vergit in detrimentum dignitatis corporis Christi, qui voluit a peccatoribus crucifigi absque diminutione suæ dignitatis, præsertim, cum mus aut canis non tangat ipsum corpus Christi secundum propriam speciem, sed solum secundum species sacramentales,—non sacramentaliter, sed per accidens corpus Christi manducat.

dialectics, was expressed by others in a still crasser form : yet the pious delicacy of many resisted a tendency which was driven, purely out of a dread of the subjective element, to a profanation of the holy essence ; and voices of commanding influence declared themselves opposed to such a conclusion. Among these we may place even the word of a pope, that of Innocent the Third, who, in his work *De Mysteriis Missae*, entered minutely into the examination of everything pertaining to this sacrament ; and in fact, we recognize in this performance the work of a man thoroughly fitted for the supreme guidance of the church,—of one who distinguished himself by a certain sound practical sense in the handling of doctrinal matters, by a certain delicate tact which led him to avoid everything which was really offensive. In replying to the question,\* *Into what is the body of Christ converted after it has been eaten ?* he says : “ So uneasy are the thoughts of mortals, that they will never leave exploring, and especially into those things respecting which man ought not to inquire at all. If we seek after the bodily presence of Christ, we must look for it in heaven, where he sits at the right hand of God. Only for a certain time he exhibited his bodily presence, in order to invite to the spiritual. As long as the sacrament is held in the hand and eaten, Christ is bodily present with that which is seen, felt, and tasted ; but when the bodily senses discern nothing more, the bodily presence must no further be sought after, but we must hold ourselves only to the spiritual. After the administration of the sacrament is finished, Christ passes from the mouth into the heart ; he is not food for the body, but for the soul.” He then adds : “ As it regards the relation to ourselves (to our perceptions), he preserves throughout the resemblance to perishable food ; but as it regards himself, he loses not the truth of the (unchangeable) body. That which outwardly appears (the species) is sometimes nibbled or stained, but no such affection can reach the true body of Christ. But if the question is asked, whether Christ spaci-ously descends from or ascends to heaven, when he offers or withdraws his bodily presence, or whether it is after some other manner that he begins or ceases to be present, under the species of the sacrament ? I answer, that in such matters we

:

\* Lib. IV. c. xv.



ought not to be too curious, lest we arrogate to ourselves more than belongs to us. I know not how Christ comes, but neither do I know how he departs; *He* knows, from whom nothing is hidden." To escape the conclusion that the body of Christ may be nibbled by mice, burned by fire, etc., he preferred rather to resort to a twofold miracle,—that, in the same manner as the substance of the bread had been converted into the body of Christ, so, afterwards, in place of it, the substance of the bread is created anew, of which substance the accidents only had remained.\* In favour of this view Bonaventura also declared himself, the thought undoubtedly floating before his mind that such things belonged to a higher province of the intuition of faith, and ought not to be brought down to this sensuous and conceptual mode of contemplation.† With regard to that other mode of apprehension, he observes, "that, however much might be said in proof of this opinion, it will never be so proved that pious ears must not be shocked at it."‡ He was inclined to admit, with pope Innocent the Third, in order to unite the hypothesis that the body of Christ in the eucharist was present only for the use of man,§ with the doctrine of transubstantiation, that the above-mentioned double miracle took place. The dread of such conclusions, and dissatisfaction with those forced resolutions of the difficulty whereby men sought to guard against such conclusions, would lead many reflecting minds to entertain doubts with regard to the premises themselves from which such conclusions were derived. A master in the university of Paris wrote, in the year 1264, a letter|| to pope Clement the Fourth, in which he defended that scientific institution against a charge which was said to have proceeded from the pope himself, that the opinion prevailed there that the eucharist stood no other-

\* Sicut miraculose substantia panis convertitur in corpus domini cum, incipit esse sub sacramento, sic quodammodo miraculose revertitur, cum ipsum ibi desinit esse, non quod illa panis substantia revertatur, quæ transivit in carnem, sed quod ejus loco alius miraculose creatus.

† His words: Caveat tamen quisque qualiter intelligit, quia in hoc secretum fidei latet.

‡ Quantumcumque hæc opinio muniatur, nunquam tamen adeo munitur, quando aures piæ hoc abhorreant audire.

§ Quia Christus non est sub illo sacramento, nisi eatenus, quod ordinabile est ad usum humanum, scilicet ad manducationem.

|| See Boulæi hist. univers. Parisiens, T. III. f. 374.

wise related to Christ than as the symbol stands related to the thing signified by it.\* Such an accusation, against which the university had occasion to defend itself, may not perhaps have been altogether without foundation, though it did not contain one word of literal truth. Accordingly, there stood forth among the members of this university, towards the close of the thirteenth century, an independent thinker,—well known on account of his skill in dispute,—the Dominican John of Paris,† who endeavoured to avoid the above-mentioned conclusions by calling up once more ‡ that opinion which, as we have seen, had not yet been lost sight of in the twelfth century,—the opinion that the body of Christ, abiding in its proper essence, was united with the substance of the bread and wine abiding in their proper essence, after the same manner as the divine nature is united with the human in Christ. According to this view, a mutual transfer and interchange of predicates might find place, as in the case of the two natures of Christ; and so these offensive conclusions might be avoided. He supposed that, as the orthodox faith in this doctrine consisted simply in maintaining the real and veritable presence of the body of Christ, so a determinate representation of the manner in which this came to pass could not—while still other representations were also possible—obtain the authority of an article of faith. He believed, moreover, that he might affirm the words of the institution were more favourable to his own view than to the opposite one.§ He was not in favour of directly condemning the common representation, but only contended against its being held as the alone valid one, while at the same time he avowed submission to the authority of the pope and of the church: yet he was prohibited in 1304 from reading and disputing. He appealed to the pope, but died at Rome while the matter was still under discussion. The transmutation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ being regarded as the highest miracle, and one daily repeated, and this highest pitch of the miraculous, and of the

\* *Esse sicuti signatum sub signo.*

† *Johannes pungens asinos*, Pique d'âne, so called, because his disputations left no quiet to indolent minds.

‡ *His Determinatio*, published by Peter Allix, London, 1686.

§ *Quod ista opinio evidētius salvat veritatem hujus propositionis: hoc est corpus meum, et quod in altari sit corpus Christi, quam alia.*

self-communication of God, being a matter which particularly busied the religious feelings and the imaginations of men, it is no wonder that visions should grow out of it; and such visions may have been the occasion which led to the founding of a festival extremely agreeable to this bent of devotion, and consecrated to the remembrance of this abiding miracle,—the festum Corporis Domini, or *Corpus-Christi* day, which, after it had first arisen—as it is said in the diocese of Liege—was established in 1264, by a bull of pope Urban the Fourth, although, as this pope soon afterwards died, the ordinance did not at first pass generally into effect, but had afterwards, in 1311, to be renewed by Clement the Fifth.

It was in correspondence with these views, that, as Christ, veiled beneath these external signs, was contemplated as actually present and inseparably connected with them, so the worship due to him was transferred to them. And accordingly it had been the custom, even before these views had reached their extreme point in the doctrine of transubstantiation, for the community, at the elevation of the consecrated emblems, to kneel to the ground; and, in general, Christ himself was worshipped in them, as appears from many indications, especially in the East, where, as a common thing, the feelings were more strongly expressed. This was a necessary expression of those modes of intuition which, after they had reached their highest point in the doctrine of transubstantiation, would, of course, be still further promoted. The papal legate, cardinal Guido, whom pope Innocent the Third sent to Cologne, is said to have first introduced the custom, already practised in Italy, of kneeling before the host, elevated after the consecration, and when borne in procession to the sick, into those districts of Germany,\* and pope Honorius the Third, by a constitution enacted in 1217, made this a law for the whole church. From this reverence for the external signs in the eucharist, this anxious dread of spilling a drop of the blood of Christ, proceeded, however, at the same time, one salutary change, which may have been already introduced of itself, through the better understanding of the relation of the eucharist to baptism, as it *certainly* found therein a basis of support. We have already seen, in the earlier periods,

\* See Cæsar. Heisterbac. Dial. Dist. IX. c. li.



that which referred to the continued, *conscious*, and self-active appropriation of this fellowship, the consciousness of such a difference between the two sacraments, contributed some share towards promoting the abandonment of infant communion.\* Already, in the beginning of the thirteenth century, the communion of infants was considered to be a thing altogether inadmissible. As piety in children, more or less pure or mingled with fanaticism,† belonged among the peculiar features of this age, so an example of this sort occurred in the year 1220, at Thoroult in Flanders. A boy, on whose tender mind religion had made a powerful impression, and who was looked upon as a prodigy of youthful piety, died before he had completed his seventh year. Before his death, he expressed an earnest desire to partake of the holy eucharist. It being supposed, however, that, according to the then existing laws of the church,‡ this privilege could not be granted him, when he found that he was about to die, stretching forth his hands to heaven, he exclaimed, “Thou, Lord Jesus Christ, knowest that my greatest desire is to have thee; I have longed after thee, and done all in my power to obtain thee; and I confidently hope that I am now going to behold thee.”

The consideration, however, which, in the manner above described, was the occasion of introducing a change in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, corresponding to its idea, contributed to promote the extensive spread of another innovation, directly at variance with this idea. In the earlier centuries it was held indispensably necessary that the holy

\* In the fifth canon of the council of Bordeaux (concilium Burdegalense), in 1255, it is already presupposed that children belonged to the class of the *prohibiti communicare*; and it is only specially decreed that the priests should not, on the Easter festival, give them the consecrated host instead of the communion. Only common consecrated bread (*panis benedictus communis*)—still a remnant, therefore, of the ancient usage—should be given them. Harduin. Concil. T. VII. f. 471.

† Thus, for example, in 1213, a summons issued by a youth led to a fanatical excitement that hurried away a vast multitude of boys to a crusade, who could not be kept back by any of the means employed, gentle or severe. See Thom. Cantiprateni Bonum universale, Lib. II. c. iii. s. 14; and Matth. Paris. hist. Angl. An. 1251, f. 710. Ed. Lond. 1686.

‡ Thomas Cantiprat, in relating this story, Lib. II. c. xxviii. s. 7, speaks of an ordinance passed by a general council prohibiting this: but no such canon of a general council is known to me.

supper, in conformity with its institution, should be distributed fully, in both kinds, to all without distinction, and should be partaken of by all. The only exception was when, as in the North African church, a portion of the consecrated bread was kept at hand, as a means of constantly maintaining communion with Christ, and as a supernatural preservative against all manner of evil; and when the wine alone was used for the communion of infants; which customs already implied, and indeed were based on, the opinion that, in cases of necessity, the communion in one kind might be substituted in place of the whole. Now the fear we have already mentioned, of spilling the least particle of Christ's Blood, led, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, especially in England, to the custom of presenting, in the communion of infants, only a portion of bread dipped in the consecrated wine. And as this was a proceeding already at variance with the words of the institution and the nature of the sacrament, both as to form and matter,\* so it formed a medium of transition to the practice of distributing the sacrament to the sick under the single species of the consecrated bread.† The same anxiety was the occasion also that, in here and there an instance, this custom should be extended still further, and that partaking of the blood of Christ should be withheld altogether from the laity. That idea of the priesthood, which placed the laity at such a distant remove from the clergy, would furnish ground for the opinion that it was enough if they, by whose instrumentality this greatest of miracles was accomplished, and the sacrifice of Christ continually offered anew, enjoyed the holy supper in its complete form, as it had been instituted by our Saviour; ‡

\* Hildebert of Mans says, concerning a custom of this sort (ep. 15): *Quod nec ex dominica institutione nec ex sanctionibus authenticis reperitur assumptum.*

† The words of the abbot Rodolph of Liege, which Boua has given in his work *De rebus liturgicis*:—

*Hinc et ibi cautela fiet,  
Ne presbyter ægris et sanis  
Tribuat laicis de sanguine Christi, nam fundi posset leviter  
Simplexque putaret, quod non sub specie sit totus Jesus utraque.*

‡ As Thomas Aquinas says: *Quod perfectio hujus sacramenti non est in usu fidelium, sed in consecratione materie. Et ideo nihil derogat perfectioni hujus sacramenti, si populus sumat corpus sine sanguine, dummodo sacerdos consecrans sumat utrumque.*

since in fact the priests offered for all, and acted in the name of all who were united with them by fellowship of spirit.\* Thus, then, a full and perfect observance was to be paid by the priests to all that the institution of Christ required. On the part of the laity, reverence towards the sacrament was to be the most prominent thing; and in accordance with this reverence they should abstain from the blood, that none of it might be spilled and profaned.† This was the acme of that spiritual aristocracy which stood in such contradiction to the idea of the Christian church; and it needed but one step more to proclaim, "it was sufficient for the priests to celebrate the communion in behalf of the entire community." There was still another element, belonging to the Christian mode of thinking in this age, that contributed to encourage and uphold this change, namely, the power attributed to the church, by virtue of the Holy Spirit which guided it, of introducing changes in the administration of the sacraments according to the necessities of the times; and the power was stretched to this extent.‡ The principle, right in itself, of distinguishing between the mutable and the immutable in the celebration of the sacraments, was, by reason of those false assumptions,

\* Conformably to that which Thomas Aquinas says: *Quia sacerdos in persona omnium sanguinem offert et sumit.*

† As Thomas says: *Ex parte sumentium requiritur summa reverentia et cautela, ne aliquid accadat, quod vergat ad injuriam tanti mysterii.*

‡ Thus already in the letter of Ernulph bishop of Rochester, near the beginning of the twelfth century, in which, in replying to the doubts proposed to him by a certain Lambert, he states how the *Hodierna ecclesiæ consuetudo* of distributing the *hostia sanguine intincta*, *alio et pane contrario ritu*, quam a Domino distributum might be justified. He supposes that everything ordained by Christ for man's salvation ought to be observed, indeed, as a matter of unconditional necessity; but that changes might be made in the form of administration, respecting which Christ had established nothing definite. "*Quæ præcepta sunt, non fieri non licere, pro ratione vero necessitatis vel honestatis alio et alio modo fieri licere.*" And he could cite other changes in proof of this, changes which the church had introduced on grounds of reason. "*Unde nonnulla Christianæ religionis instituta eum in ecclesiæ nascentis initio modum originis accepere, quem in progressu ejusdem crescentis propter quasdam rationabiles causas non diu tennere.*"—See D'Achery *Spicileg. T. III. f. 470.* We must allow, however, that when the mutable and the immutable, in respect to matter and form, were distinguished by such inexact limits, a wide field would be opened for arbitrary procedures.

falsely applied. Furthermore, this change found another ground of support in the doctrine of concomitance, so called ; which, however, was neither devised nor got up for this purpose, but had been first evolved independently thereof,\* and was first employed by the schoolmen of the thirteenth century,† in defence of the withdrawal of the cup,—the doctrine that, under each species, the whole of Christ was contained, *per concomitantiam*, therefore, under the body, the blood ; so that he who partook of but one species lost nothing.

It was above a century, however, before the scruples against a deviation from the institution of Christ and the ancient and universal custom of the church could be wholly overcome. Not only was this change not approved in the twelfth century, except in single portions of the church, but even a pope, Paschalis the Second, declared himself decidedly opposed to it. In a letter to Pontius abbot of Cluny, he wrote that no arbitrary will of man, nor innovating spirit, ought to be allowed to deviate from the course that Christ had ordained. As Christ communicated bread and wine, each by itself, and it ever had been so observed in the church, it ever should be so done in the future, save in the case of infants and of the sick, who, as a general thing, could not eat bread.”‡ Yet the withdrawal of the cup, favoured by the highest authorities of the thirteenth century, the first theologians of both the orders of mendicants, among whom Albert the Great constitutes the only exception, constantly advanced to more general recognition. Near the close of the twelfth century, the provost Folmar of Traufenstein, in France, took ground against the doctrine of concomitance employed to defend the withdrawal of the cup ; and he seems by this opposition to have been driven to a view of the Lord's Supper deviating from the church doctrine, although he was too much confined by his dependence on the authority of the church to be able to make that which he wanted wholly clear to himself, and to carry it out in a consistent manner. He agreed, it is true, that the true body of Christ was in the eucharist ; but he supposed not wholly, with all its members, as Christ had lived

\* For example, by Anselm of Canterbury.

† After the precedent of bishop Ernulph.

‡ Harduin. Concil. T. VI. p. ii. f. 1796.



on earth; that the whole Christ was, by virtue of the union of the two natures, in each species, but not the whole, completely, in all its parts. In each species, he would probably say, he is present only in one particular form.\* As he maintained that, even by Christ's glorification, the difference of the predicates, applied to the two natures, was not annulled, so he contended against the supposition of an ubiquity; and held, on the contrary, that Christ, till the time of his second advent, abode, with his glorified body, only in heaven. When his opponents brought up against him the stories which had gone abroad since the time of Paschasius Radbert, about actual manifestations of the body and blood of Christ, he declared such stories to be false: he looked upon them as mere fables, that harmonized in no sort with the doctrine of Holy Scripture. The sources from which these legends had been derived he considered as not entitled to the least credit.† Thus we perceive that, at bottom, he possessed an original and independent bent of spirit, directly at variance with that of the church. But before he could come to the point of expressing it, in a clear and consistent manner, he was induced to recant.‡

That view of the Lord's supper which represented the miracle performed by the priests as the principle thing did

\* *Totus, sed non totum et non totaliter.*

† Gerhoh of Reichersberg says, in the work directed against him, and intitled *De gloria et honore filii hominis*, c. xiii. in *Pez thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, T. I. p. ii. f. 221: Folmar had asserted, *dictis et scriptis, corpus Domini, ex quo ascendit, nunquam fuisse sub cælo. Cui cum nos inter cætera objiceremus, quod multi sanctorum viderint eum corporaliter, postquam ascendit in cælum, sicut corporaliter visus est Petro, dixit hoc totum esse fabulosum. Neque canonicis fultum scripturis.*—Gerhoh now argues that, according to the position of his antagonist, the account given by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, of Christ's appearance to Paul, should be regarded as fabulous and uncanonical. But it was certainly very far from the intention of his opponent to affirm anything like this. If the latter really expressed the opinion, thus broadly, that Christ could not, after his ascension, again appear on earth, he must have explained this appearance as being a supernatural vision, which, however, it is hardly credible that he did. Probably he only spoke of those tales, altogether fabulous both in matter and form, which were commonly made use of in defence of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

‡ The sources are to be found in the above-cited volume of the collection by *Pez*, and in the 25th volume of the *Bibl. patr. Lugd.* It is to be regretted that we possess but a few fragments of Folmar himself.

not serve to promote the participation of the laity in the sacrament. One evidence that shows how far this was from being the case is, the twenty-first canon of the Lateran council in 1215, whereby it is ordained that every one should partake of the holy supper at least once a year, on the Easter festival. Whoever failed of so doing was to be excluded from church fellowship, and, at his death, to be refused burial according to the rites of the church. So much the greater reliance was placed on the priestly sacrifice of the mass, and the vast multitude of unworthy ecclesiastics turned it into a means of gain. Such persons undertook, for the sake of the profit, to hold more masses than they could themselves perform. They entered into contracts to perform a certain number of masses, which they obligated themselves to hold for twenty or thirty years; and when they had undertaken more than they were able to perform, hired assistants, who went through with a mechanical performance of the liturgical acts in their stead.\* Pious individuals contended against this abuse as a most abominable species of simony, Christ himself being here held up for sale, as he was by Judas. The free-spirited Abelard declaimed against the cupidity of the priests, by whom many, even when dying, were deceived with the idle promise of salvation, if they should secure a sufficient number of masses, which however could not be had without pay. "They advise these dying men," says he, "not to restore what they have robbed from others, but to offer it for the sacrifice of the mass."† The ecclesiastical assemblies at length considered it necessary to enact laws against such abuses.‡ These abuses were not necessarily connected, we

\* As, for instance, *Petrus Cantor, verbum abbreviatum*, c. xxvii. et xxviii.

† *Multos morientium seducit cupiditas sacerdotum, vanam eis securitatem promittentium, si quæ habent, sacrificiis obtulerint, et missas emant, quas nequaquam gratis haberent. In quo quidem mercimonio præfixum apud eos pretium constat esse, pro una scilicet missa unum denarium, et pro uno annuali quadraginta. In his Ethics or his Scito te ipsum*, c. xviii. in *Pez thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, p. ii. f. 666.

‡ See the Council of Paris, of the year 1212: *Ne pro annalibus vel triennialibus vel septennialibus missarum faciendis laici vel alii dare aliquid vel legare cogantur in testamento, et ne super his aliqua pactio vel exactio vel sub aliqua alia specie palliata a sacerdotibus vel aliis mediatoribus fiat, et ne superflua multitudine talium annalium se onerent*

admit, with that particular mode of intuition of which we have been speaking; on the contrary, the loftiness of the transaction, as an offering of Christ, was appealed to in order to expose the detestable character of this traffic:\* but the whole of this externalizing, magic-seeking bent, furnished, to say the least, a foothold for such superstition and such profanation.

In the administration of the sacrament of penance the mischief-working abuses of the church stand forth with particular prominence; but on this point we must take care to distinguish the false representations of the church-doctrine, which were encouraged by ignorant and badly-disposed preachers, from that doctrine as it was taught in the schools of theology. Men were aware of the distinction between the divine forgiveness of sin and church absolution. It was acknowledged that the former could be obtained only by the *inward* confession of sin, and that true repentance which springs from love. When a priest inquired of Yves bishop of Chartres, how the practice of the church—to exclude those who confessed their sins for a season from partaking of the eucharist—was to be reconciled with the words of the prophet Ezekiel,—that the sinner shall live if he but sighs to God, and returns from his evil ways,—the bishop replied: “To that judge who looks upon the heart, inward conversion, and the contrition of the heart, sufficeth; and the forgiveness of sin is immediately bestowed by him to whom this inward conversion is manifest; but the church requires a public satisfaction, because she cannot know the secrets of the heart.”† Peter Lombard declared, that the power to bind and to loose bestowed on the priest did not consist in this, that he actually had it in his power to forgive sins and confer justification, which was the work of God alone. The priest could only declare the judgment of God,‡ and the priestly sentence was valid only when it agreed with the divine. He distinguished, therefore, between absolution in the sight of God and in the view of the

sacerdotes, ad quæ supplenda sufficere honeste non possint et propter quæ ipsos oporteat habere conductitios sacerdotes.

\* The greater guilt incurred in the profanation of this sacrament by simony, Petr. Cant. c. xxvii: Totus enim Christus ibi sumitur fons et origo omnium gratiarum.

† See ep. 228.

‡ Ostendere hominem ligatum vel solutum.

church ;\* but in holding fast to the inward requisites,—necessary in order to the obtaining of the divine forgiveness of sin,—men were at the same time at no loss for reasons to justify everything that prevailed in the practice of the church. That interior state of the soul,—genuine contrition of heart,—must necessarily express itself by some outward and corresponding sign. Inward humiliation before God must exhibit itself by the outward self-humiliation of penance before the priest. The inward confession of sins must be accompanied with an outward confession ; the inward self-castigation for sin, in *contrition*, by penitential exercises, voluntarily undertaken according to the direction of the priest. So the three following parts of penance, as determined by Peter of Lombardy, ever continued to be held fast : the *compunctio cordis*, the *confessio oris*, and the *satisfactio operis*. In the doctrine, that for sins committed subsequently to baptism it was required that a peculiar species of satisfaction should be paid to divine justice, the necessity of church penance found its substantial basis ; and the effects of it might, in the next place, extend even beyond the bounds of the present life ; for after it had once been determined that such a species of justification was necessary, it was easy to infer from it, that whosoever neglected to pay such satisfaction in the present life would have to suffer hereafter, for the purpose of expiation and purification, so much the severer pains in the fires of purgatory. At the same time, however, it was supposed that the above-mentioned inward self-punishment might be of sufficient force to be substituted in place of all other satisfactions ; so that the individual thus circumstanced stood exempted from the necessity of enduring the fires of purgatory. At all events, the church doctrine and scientific theology were very far from attributing any important influence to the external act separated from the internal disposition. The temper of the heart was ever held up to view as that from which everything must proceed ; but the blame lies with the ordinary priests, that this connection between the inward temper and outward act, in the religious sense of the multitude, was obscured, and that the people were confirmed in the delusive notion that forgiveness of sin could be obtained by outward works, and in

\* *Solutio apud Deum et in facie ecclesiæ.*

their mistaken confidence on priestly absolution, which was often but too easily bestowed. The laws enacted by the first popes of this period had for their object to counteract such abuses. Thus it undoubtedly belonged to the essence of the Hildebrandian reform of the church, that on this point also the ancient order of the church should be restored. We have noticed already, on a former page,\* the interest taken in this matter by Gregory the Seventh. Pope Urban the Second declared,† that “Whereas false penance belongs especially among the causes which disturb the peace of the church, therefore we admonish the bishops and priests against deceiving the souls of the laity by false penance, and thus causing them to be hurried to perdition. But false penance is, where penance is done on account of one sin to the overlooking of many others.” In confutation of this error, which led men to suppose that they had done enough by leaving off one class of sins, while they still indulged themselves in others, the pope quotes James ii. 10 : “It is also denominated false penance for one not to abandon the business of an ordinary calling which he cannot pursue without sin, or to harbour hatred in his heart ; or to refuse satisfaction to one whom he has wronged, or forgiveness for wrongs he has himself received, or to bear arms against a righteous cause.” Yet the authorities at Rome did not remain true to these principles of ecclesiastical legislation, when they too easily granted absolution to those who from other lands resorted to the highest tribunal, and a mischief-working change, in the matter of absolution, proceeded from that very quarter.

In the first place, by virtue of the monarchical ecclesiastical power of the popes, it was possible to introduce, instead of the absolutions hitherto dispensed by the bishops in behalf of their respective dioceses, a more general absolution, valid for the whole church ; and while it was the case hitherto that absolution was only limited and partial in its extent, another kind now appeared in its stead, of wider grasp, which tended to the dispensing with all church penance. The crusades furnished the first occasion for this. Pope Victor the Second, when preaching a crusade against the infidels in North Africa, having first set a precedent of this sort, it was often followed

\* Page 111. † Concilium Melfitanum, c. xvi. Harduin, vii. f. 1687.

on occasion of the crusades to the Holy Sepulchre, when it was held that the participation in so holy an enterprise ought to be considered a valid substitute for all other penance; and so a full and unconditional absolution came to be connected therewith. Yet it must be allowed that true devotion and penitence were still appended as a condition. Thus, for example, Urban the Second, at the council of Clermont, in 1095, extended this indulgence expressly to those alone who, from motives of simple piety, and not for the sake of honour or of money, embarked in the expedition to liberate the church at Jerusalem. But the crimes to which the crusaders abandoned themselves testify of the immense injury that grew out of the confidence in the power of absolution.

Absolution received a theoretical support from the theologians of the thirteenth century. They were directed thereto by that idea of Christian fellowship,—though conceived after a false and external manner,—which generally exercised so vast a power over the religious life of these times,—the sense of that fellowship of divine life by which everything was upborne that proceeded from the Christian spirit,—the conviction that each one, through the fellowship of the same spirit,—which works everything in all its organs,—shared in all the benefits accruing from that spirit,—the invisible bond that knit together all Christians, however separated by time and space. Hence the notion of a treasury of merits, belonging to the whole church. In addition to this came now that representation, which in earlier periods we saw already existing in the bud, and which had its ground in a false apprehension of the idea of the law,—the representation, namely, that the saints possessed a superlegal perfection,\*—had performed more than justice required in satisfaction for their own sins; where, to be sure, the treasure of Christ's merits was assumed as the foundation of the whole, without which it was vain to talk of human merit.† Christ was

\* Thus Thomas of Aquino says (Supplement. tertie partis summae theol. Qu. xiii. Art. i.): Est quedam mensura homini adhibita, quæ ab eo requiritur, scilicet impletio mandatorum Dei, et superea potest aliquid erogare, ut satisfaciat.

† Robert Pullein still speaks only of a treasure of the merits of Christ: *cujus merita præcedentium patrum insufficientiam supplerent, ut merita antiquorum per Christum accepta Deo digna fiant munerari cælo.*

pointed to as the primal source of all sanctification.\* Thus arose the doctrine of a *thesaurus meritorum supererogationis*, from which the church, and especially its visible head, could, for reasonable causes,—as, for example, for the advancement of a holy work of general importance,—appropriate to individuals whatever might be requisite, as a satisfaction for their own sins. It was at the same time held fast, we allow, that the indulgence so bestowed was not *forgiveness* of sin, but only a remission of the church-penance, which would otherwise have to be fulfilled by each. Yet, as this was to take the place of the punishment which must otherwise be suffered in purgatory, it followed that the effects of this indulgence might bear indirectly even upon the forgiveness of sin.† Beyond question, it was still presupposed that they who received the indulgence were in a state of true penitence, and by faith and love united to the saints, whose merits were placed over to their account. Had the doctrine of indulgence always been taught and received with these limitations, it might not have been so injurious to morality as it in fact proved to be; but the unspiritual men, who were determined to gain the utmost which they possibly could from an indulgence granted for the building of a church, for the visitation of the same, etc., sought only to fix a high value on their spiritual merchandise, and were extremely careful how they added anything in the way of limitation. William of Auxerre,‡ a scholastic theologian of the thirteenth century, after having laid down six propositions necessary for the understanding of the doctrine of indulgence, very naïvely observes: “If we should state all these explanations in preaching the doctrine of indulgences,

\* Thus pope Innocent the Third, in his exposition of the second penitential psalm, says: *Satis enim apparet, quis orat, quoniam omnis sanctus, videlicet servus sanctificatus, et ad quem orat, quoniam ad te, videlicet Dominum sanctificantem, et quare orat, quia pro hac, id est, pro impietatis remissione, quæ sanctificationis est causa, f. 241.*

† There were those who considered absolution as referring simply to the penalties incurred at the tribunal of the church; but Thomas Aquinas combats this opinion, as, in fact, he was obliged to do by the connection of ideas in the church doctrine; for the remissio, quæ fit quantum ad forum ecclesiæ, valet etiam quantum ad forum Dei et præterea ecclesiæ hujusmodi indulgentias faciens magis damnificaret quam adjuvaret, quia remitteret ad graviore pœnas scilicet purgatorii.

‡ Gulielmus Antissiodorensis.

the latter would not find so many purchasers ; just as the laity, if they should understand that one good work is worth as much as a hundred others, performed with only the same amount of love, would not be inclined to do so many good works.\* Still, however, the church does not deceive the faithful ; for she teaches nothing false, but only conceals certain truths."† Also, Thomas Aquinas cites the opinion of some, who believed that the benefit of indulgences was, in the case of each individual, according to the measure of his faith and piety ; ‡—yet this dependence of indulgences on the personal character of the subject was not expressed in the preaching of them ; for the church incited men to good works by means of a *pious fraud*, like the mother who holds out an apple to her child to induce it to walk. Yet he himself repelled such a doctrine with abhorrence, declaring it to be fraught with danger, since thereby all confidence in the affirmations of the church would necessarily be weakened.

The enormous abuses which came to be connected with the matter of indulgences called forth against it many important voices in the church ; some attacking nothing but that which was not grounded in the church doctrine, but was solely to be attributed to the corruption of the clergy ; and some making war against the whole system of indulgences. Abelard complains of the priests that betrayed the souls committed to their spiritual oversight, not so much through ignorance as cupidity, the love of money availing more with them than the will of their Master,§ Even the bishops were fiercely attacked by him. He reproached them on account of the lavish manner in which they dispensed indulgences at the dedication of

\* His words : Quia si determinarentur, non essent fideles ita proni ad dandum, sicut si prædicaretur laicis, quod quantum valet unum opus meritorium ad vitam æternam, tantum et mille facta ex tanta caritate, non essent ita proni ad faciendum bona opera.

† Ecclesia decipit fideles, tamen non mentitur. See the summa in iv. libb. sententiar, l. iv. of the chapter, de relaxationibus, quæ fiunt per claves.

‡ Quod indulgentiæ non tantum valent, quantum prædicantur, sed unicuique tantum valent, quantum fides et devotio sua exigit.

§ Ut pro nummorum oblatione satisfactionis inunctæ pœnas condonent vel relaxent, non tam attendentes, quid velit Dominus, quam quid valeat nummus.



churches and altars, at the consecration of burial-places, and on other occasions of popular festivity ; under the show, indeed, of love, but really impelled by the grossest cupidity.\* True love for their flocks, he suspected, would be shown by their bestowing these indulgences for nothing. If it lay within their power to open and shut heaven, they ought not to suffer an individual of their flocks to perish. But they might well be congratulated if they were able to open heaven even for themselves;† he declared it impossible that the arbitrary will of bishops should bring anything to pass against the justice of the divine tribunal, or that any unjust sentence should be confirmed by the Almighty. With Origen, whose words he cites, he maintained that the power conferred on the apostles to bind and to loose had not been communicated to the bishops as the apostles' successors in office, but only to those among them who were the apostles' successors in temper of mind ; just as the words, " Ye are the salt of the earth,"‡ applied only to such.‡

When a bountiful indulgence was offered to the abbot Stephen of Obaize, to assist in the erection of a church which he had much at heart, he declined accepting it, saying, " We have no wish to introduce a custom whereby we should prepare a scandal for the communities, and shame for ourselves, in assuming to give an indulgence which God alone can bestow."§ And when, in despite of this, he once allowed himself to be persuaded to receive a letter of indulgence in behalf of certain persons about to form a fraternity for the purpose of erecting a new church, and he was asked, while the letter was being drawn up, how far he would have the indulgence extend, his ancient scruples were revived, and he

\* Sub quadam scilicet specie caritatis, sed in veritate summæ cupiditatis.

† Quod quidem si non possunt, vel nesciunt, certe illud pœticum, in quantum arbitror, incurrunt :—

Nec prosunt domino, quæ prosunt omnibus, artes

‡ See Abelard's Ethics, c. xxvi. Pez. L. c. f. 682.

§ Nos talem consuetudinem introducere nolumus, et populis scandalum et nobis ignominiam acquiramus circumeundo ecclesias, ostendendo beneficia, indulgentias largiendo, quas dare non poterit nisi solus Deus.

said : " Our own sins still weigh heavy on us, and we cannot make light of those of others."\*

The Franciscan Berthold constantly declaims with the greatest vehemence against the preachers of indulgences, whom he was accustomed to call penny-preachers, and whom he describes as the deadliest traitors to souls, the murderers of true penitence : " These penny-preachers, who discourse so finely before the people concerning God, in order that they may strip them of their money ; so they leave off confession, and comfort themselves with their indulgences. Because such an one (such a preacher of indulgences) can discourse so very eloquently about God, they fancy he is a saint. He is as really the devil's as he stands there and cheats Christendom. He is as much the devil's as any robber in the forest. And had I to choose, I would rather, an' there were no help for it, my soul should pass out of the mouth of a robber than out of the mouth of a penny-preacher ; for the former ruins but his own soul, while the penny-preacher ruins many thousands besides. For all who are lost by means of his false indulgences are cast to the bottom of hell, while he must suffer all their torments as his own. As Judas sold his Lord, so thou sellest away from him many thousand souls, beyond all hope of retrieve."† " Fic ! on thee, penny-preacher, murderer of the whole world ! How many souls dost thou, for the sake of thy false gain, seduce from true repentance, and cast to the bottom of hell, beyond all reach of help ? Thou promisest a large indulgence for a penny or a farthing ; so that many thousands foolishly imagine they have expiated all their sins with their penny, or their farthing, as thou snuffest out to them. So they leave off confessing themselves ; and thus go on to perdition, with none to tell them better. And for this thou shalt be cast to the bottom of hell, and all these shall be cast upon thee, thou who hast seduced and sold them away from Almighty God ! Yes, souls ! for a penny, or a farthing ! Thou murderer of true penitence, thou hast destroyed for us true penitence. This the penny-preachers have so utterly destroyed for us, that there is now scarcely an

\* Nos nostra adhuc premunt peccata nec possumus levare aliena. Lib. II. c. xviii.

† In the edition cited above, on page 207.

individual who is willing to confess his sins.” \* He describes these preachers as being the vilest of hypocrites, who pretended to great piety, and understood how to set forth the sufferings of Christ and of the martyrs in a touching manner, so as to induce the common people to purchase their indulgences: “He dwells so much, and in so many ways, on our Lord’s sufferings, that they imagine he is a true messenger of God; then he weeps, and practises all sorts of tricks, that he may get their pennies, and their souls to boot. Oftentimes the Netherlander affects the speech of the Highlander; † for example, the dissembler and penny-preacher, who discourses so much about God and his mother, and his saints and their sufferings,—and weeps into the bargain,—so that one might swear he was a true Highlander. By his dress, also, such a person may deceive, but not for any long time by his manners.” ‡ The popes thought it necessary to enact several laws against the too wide extension of indulgences; and these laws bear testimony also to the great mischief occasioned by them: “Whereas, through the indefinite and superfluous indulgences which many prelates boldly take it upon them so ordain, the keys of the church fall into contempt, and penance loses its virtue; therefore, be it decreed that, at the consecration of a church, whether performed by one bishop or by several, indulgence shall not be extended to any term beyond a year,” etc. The pope—who, though possessed of plenary power, was still used to set these limits to himself—was held out to them as a pattern. § At a council held at Beziers in South France, || which especially set itself to oppose the sects that were now spreading with such mighty power in those districts, a canon was also drawn up against abuses in the granting of indulgences,—a step undoubtedly connected with the same object; since the mischiefs occasioned by the preachers of indulgences assuredly supplied those sects with a great abundance of reasons for attacking the dominant church. It was decreed that “none but suitable persons, furnished with testimonies from their superiors, should

\* Page 402.

† Highland, symbol of heaven; Lowland, of hell.

‡ See page 438.

§ Concil. Lat. iv. 1215, c. lxii.

|| Concilium Biterrense.

be tolerated as preachers of indulgences; since it was certain that hireling preachers of indulgences, and those who used them as hirelings, had, no less by their wicked lives than by their erroneous preaching, caused great scandal by promising, for a small sum of money, to procure deliverance for the condemned in hell.”\*

Finally, an ordinance was passed by Pope Innocent the Third, which was expressly designed to counteract the breaking up of the discipline of penance. Confession of sins to the priest had, indeed, until now, been recommended, and considered as belonging to the self-humiliation of the delinquent; but it was only in case of mortal sins, involving the exclusion of the subject from the kingdom of heaven, that such confession was held to be indispensably necessary; since, in this case, the three parts of penance distinguished by Peter of Lombardy must all come together. That which had hitherto been left an optional matter was by Innocent the Third prescribed as settled law. He directed, in the twenty-first canon of the fourth Lateran council, in 1215, that each individual of the male and female sex should, after having arrived at the years of discretion, truly and faithfully confess, for himself alone, all his sins, at least once a year, to his own priest, and strive to perform according to his ability the penance imposed upon him; and at least once a year, on the Easter festival, partake of the holy eucharist; unless, after hearing the advice of his own priest, he thought himself, for good reasons, bound to abstain from it for a season. But if, for good and valid reasons, any one should choose to confess his sins to a foreign priest, he must first ask and obtain permission so to do from his own priest; otherwise the foreign priest could not exercise the power to bind and to loose. It was especially enjoined on the priest to exercise prudence and wisdom in the care of souls. He was directed to inform himself exactly with regard to the circumstances of the sinner and of his sin, in order that from these data he might be able skilfully to determine what counsel to give, and what remedies to apply. The strictest confidence with regard to the matters confessed was enjoined on the priest, with severe penalties in case of transgression. By means of

\* V. Harduin. Concil. T. VIII. f. 409.

this introduction of oral confession into the laws of the church, it was intended to put a check on the loose administration of the penitential system generally; to compel the priest to a more strict moral oversight over his community, and to prevent the laity from withdrawing themselves from it. A stricter discharge of the pastoral duties was thus secured, and the tie more closely knit betwixt the priest and his people. Such a regulation corresponded with the spirit of the church, which would preserve the religious consciousness of the laity in a state of entire dependence on the priest.

END OF VOL. VII.





